

STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AGENDA

MARCH 25, 1999

11:45 a.m.

**James Monroe Building
9th Floor Conference Room
Richmond, Virginia**

11:45 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes from February 16, 1999

Tab 1

Director's Report

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Program Approval

P2

Mary Washington College
Bachelors of Professional Studies

RESOURCE COMMITTEE REPORT

OUTREACH COMMITTEE REPORT

**Resources Committee will meet following the conclusion of the
Council Meeting**

NOTE:

Materials contained in this Agenda Book are intended for consideration by the Council at its meeting (dated above), and may not reflect final Council action. For a final version of any item contained in these materials, please visit the Council's website at www.schev.edu or contact Lee Rung at lrung@schev.edu.

**STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FEBRUARY 16, 1999
MINUTES NO. 449**

The February meeting of the Council of Higher Education was called to order by John D. Padgett, chair, at 10:45 a.m. at Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, VA. Members present: H. Lynn Hopewell, vice-chair; Douglas Combs, Walter M. Curt, John W. Gerdelman, Scott Goodman, Kate O. Griffin, Rayford L. Harris, Karen F. Marcus, and Anne Marie Whittemore. Council staff present: William B. Allen, Belinda Anderson Peter A. Blake, A. Fletcher Mangum, G. Paul Nardo, Phyllis Palmiero, and Pamela H. Landrum.

Mr. Padgett thanked Dr. Anderson and members of his staff for hosting the Council meeting. He also thanked Dr. and Mrs. Anderson for the hospitality extended to the Council and staff at the reception and dinner in their home on Monday evening.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On motion by Ms Marcus, seconded by Ms Whittemore, the agenda for the February meeting was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Ms Marcus, seconded by Ms Whittemore, the minutes of the January 19, 1999 meeting were approved as submitted.

PRESENTATION BY MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE

Dr. William M. Anderson, president of Mary Washington College, gave an overview of activities at Mary Washington College. He also elaborated on Mary Washington's plans for the Stafford Campus.

Dr. Anderson praised the Council for taking the time to visit the various institutions and for showing an interest in what's happening at the individual campuses.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dr. Allen reviewed the Council's schedule of meetings. He indicated that as requested by the Council, plans for a system-wide retreat are underway. The proposed date for the retreat is June 21 and 22 and would be held in conjunction with the June Council meeting. He stated the purpose of the retreat would be to bring all the stakeholders together to discuss the Virginia Plan. Dr. Allen stated that Ms Landrum would contact members regarding their availability.

Dr. Allen reminded Council of the Outstanding Faculty Awards press conference and reception on Wednesday, February 17. He asked for a show of hands of those planning to attend for assurance that their names were on the guest list for the reception at Governor's Mansion.

Dr. Allen highlighted legislative bills relating to higher education. He commented that Council staff tracked approximately 140 bills relating to higher education, with special attention to about 40 bills. The staff continues to produce LAS's (legislative action summary) and FIS's (fiscal impact statement) for the administration.

Dr. Allen reported that the Secretary of Education had communicated on behalf of the Governor the wish that the staff avoid direct communication with the General Assembly with respect to the legislation pending. He reported that in the area of financial aid and scholarships, the Council has had a large influence. He indicated that there were a number of bills that seek to establish GPA requirements for financial aid, with 2.0 being the most frequently cited level. He stated that the most important thing to note is that this is almost certainly going to become law this year. He indicated that the Council played a very important role in making this happen.

Dr. Allen highlighted the number of legislative studies directed toward the Council. He reported that SCHEV's legislation to sponsor participation with SREB's Electronic Campus, had passed both houses, is supported by the Governor and seems to be well on its way to establishment.

Dr. Allen announced recent staffing changes, and reported on the pending retirement of the agency's budget manager in the fall.

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms Whittemore briefed the Council on the retreat held on Monday afternoon relating to the system-strategic plan. She also reviewed the schedule for receiving reports on decentralization and the general education study.

Program Approval – William and Mary

Ms Whittemore briefed the Council on William and Mary's proposal to initiate a new Master of Accounting degree in Accounting.

On a vote of 10-0 the Council approved the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to the College of William and Mary for initiation of a Master of Accounting in Accounting (CIP 52.0301), effective Fall 1999.

Institutional Approvals

Ms Whittemore reviewed with the Council the recommendation of the Planning Committee. She indicated that these programs have met the requirements outlined in the guidelines.

Mr. Curt introduced a motion allowing for each recommendation to be voted on individually. Mr. Combs seconded the motion. On a vote of 4 to 6 the motion was defeated.

On a vote of 7 to 2 (Mr. Combs and Mr. Curt voted no; Mr. Goodman abstained from voting) the following resolutions were approved:

In-State Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education authorize Dominion College to enroll students in courses for degree credit leading to an Associate of Applied Science in Systems Engineering and Associate of Applied Science in Computer Programming for a two-year term ending January 19, 2001, and to offer a Diploma Program in Computer Network Technician at its Harrisonburg campus.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grant Liberty University approval to offer the Master of Education degree in a distance format and to award the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership in both standard and distance format

BE IT RESOLVED that Council of Higher Education grant the University of Management and Technology authorization to enroll students in courses leading to a Doctor of Philosophy in Management for a two-year term ending January 19, 2001, with the stipulation that prior to seeking full approval the institution document its efforts to become accredited by an accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Out-of-state Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grant American University approval to offer courses for degree credit as part of the AUGate program at its site in Northern Virginia.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grant American InterContinental University approval to award the Bachelor of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology, Bachelor of Business Administration, Master of Business Administration, and

Associate of International Business degrees at a new site in Dulles for a two-year term ending on January 19, 2001.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education extend the approval of American School of Professional Psychology to award the Doctor of Psychology degree at its site in Arlington for a two-year term ending on June 1, 2001.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher education grant National-Louis University re-approval of all previously approved programs and approval to award the Master in Business Administration and Master of Education in Interdisciplinary Studies in Curriculum and Instruction degrees at its site in Northern Virginia.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grant the University of Oklahoma approval to award a Master of Public Administration degree at a new site at Quantico Marine Base for a two-year term ending on January 19, 2001.

Decisions of the Director:

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council of Higher Education reflect the action of the director in recognizing the religious exemption of El Bethel Bible Institute, Unique Bible Institute, and Cambridge Institute of Theology and authorizing the use of the name Patrick Henry College.

Mr. Padgett indicated that as procedure, members voting “no” have the opportunity to make a statement for the record. The following statements were made.

Mr. Curt indicated that he intended to vote against similar approvals as long as they were not separated individually.

Mr. Combs added that he considered the Council’s institutional approvals process inadequate and that the present standards impose very limited and minimal restrictions and burdens on the institutions or the programs. Regulations call for a very strict review of the process during the one to two-year, temporary procedure, and that is not being done satisfactorily.

RESOURCES COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms Griffin reported on the adopted workplan for developing a funding policy. She encouraged Council members to review the workplan and become aware of the deliverables that are expected not only of the staff but of the Council.

Ms Griffin expressed thanks to the staff for their hard work on this demanding issue.

OUTREACH COMMITTEE REPORT

Ms Marcus introduced an acceptance resolution recognizing the 1999 Outstanding Faculty Award recipients.

On a vote of 10 to 0, the Council approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Virginia's system of higher education consists of 39 state-supported and more than 70 private not-for-profit and for-profit private colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, that system is actively educating more than 300,000 students of all ages, from all parts of the Commonwealth and the country, at any one time; and

WHEREAS, Virginia's system-of higher education contributes to the economic prosperity and social progress of the Commonwealth by providing trained workers, community service, and valuable research; and

WHEREAS, the success of the system and those who benefit from it are attributable to the dedicated and hard-working faculty at all Virginia institutions; and

WHEREAS, the quality of the faculty at Virginia's institutions of higher education is unparalleled; and

WHEREAS, Virginia faculty have contributed in countless ways to the intellectual and personal development of their students and thereby to the quality of the civic, cultural, and intellectual vitality of the Commonwealth

WHEREAS, the Outstanding Faculty Awards Program appropriately recognizes the finest among Virginia's faculty for their teaching, research, and community service efforts; and

WHEREAS, Virginia faculty have played a central role in both the development and dissemination of knowledge; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of Higher Education is pleased to recognize those selected as 1999 Outstanding

Faculty Award recipients and who will officially be announced by the Governor and First Lady on February 17, 1999; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council of Higher Education graciously thank the recipients for dedication to teaching, research and public service and wish them well in their very important work of serving as faculty members at Virginia's colleges and universities.

Ms Marcus thanked Mr. Nardo, Ms Bradford, and Ms Robinson for their work in organizing the awards program.

Mr. Nardo updated the Council on the Council of Visitors meeting. He indicated that tentative arrangements have been made to hold the next meeting in conjunction with the Board of Visitors Training on April 30.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Pamela H. Landrum, Secretary

STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
AGENDA**

MARCH 25, 1999

8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

**James Monroe Building
10th Floor Conference Room**

ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes from February 15, 1999 P1
3. Program Approval P2

Mary Washington College
Bachelor of Professional Studies

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Liaison Report
5. New Program Proposals P3
 - A. GMU – MS Health Systems Management
 - B. JMU – MS Integrated Science and Technology
 - C. UVA – BIS Interdisciplinary Studies
 - D. SWVCC – AAS in Respiratory Care
 - E. VCCS – AAS in Technical Studies
6. Institutional Approvals P4
7. General Education Study P5
8. Decentralization of Academic Program Approval P6
9. Virginia Plan P7

**STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES NO. 25
FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

The February meeting of the Planning Committee was called to order by Anne Marie Whittemore, chair, at 4:30 p.m., at Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia. Members present: Rayford L. Harris, Scott Goodman, H. Lynn Hopewell, and John D. Padgett. Other Council present: Douglas Combs, John W. Gerdeman, and Karen F. Marcus. Council staff present: William B. Allen, Belinda Anderson, Donna R. Brodd, G. Paul Nardo, Phyllis Palmiero, Carol Pfeiffer, Karl L. Schilling, and Pamela H. Landrum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On motion by Mr. Padgett, seconded by Mr. Harris, the agenda for the February meeting was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Mr. Padgett, the minutes of the January 19, 1999 meeting were approved as submitted.

PROGRAM APPROVAL

Ms Whittemore reminded the Committee of the discussion regarding the proposal by William and Mary. She indicated that requested information had been provided.

The Committee discussed the effect this program might have on other programs already in existence.

On motion by Mr. Hopewell, seconded by Mr. Harris, and on a vote of 5 – 0, the Committee approved the following resolution to be submitted to the full Council for approval.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants approval to the College of William and Mary for initiation of a Master of Accounting in Accounting (CIP 52.0301), effective Fall 1999.

INSTITUTIONAL APPROVALS

Dr. Allen indicated that the additional information that was requested at the January meeting had been provided.

On the motion by Mr. Hopewell, seconded by Mr. Harris, and on a vote of 4-0 (with Mr. Goodman not voting), the Committee approved the following resolutions to be submitted to the full Council for approval:

In-State Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education authorizes Dominion College to enroll students in courses for degree credit leading to an Associate of Applied Science in Systems Engineering and Associate of Applied Science in Computer Programming for a two-year term ending January 19, 2001, and to offer a Diploma Program in Computer Network Technician at its Harrisonburg campus.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants Liberty University approval to offer the Master of Education degree in a distance format and to award the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership in both standard and distance format

BE IT RESOLVED that Council of Higher Education grants the University of Management and Technology authorization to enroll students in courses leading to a Doctor of Philosophy in Management for a two-year term ending January 19, 2001, with the stipulation that prior to seeking full approval the institution document its efforts to become accredited by an accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Out-of-state Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants American University approval to offer courses for degree credit as part of the AUGate program at its site in Northern Virginia.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants American InterContinental University approval to award the Bachelor of Information Technology, Master of Information Technology, Bachelor of Business Administration, Master of Business Administration, and Associate of International Business degrees at a new site in Dulles for a two-year term ending on January 19, 2001.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education extends the approval of American School of Professional Psychology to award the Doctor of Psychology degree at its site in Arlington for a two-year term ending on June 1, 2001.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher education grants National-Louis University re-approval of all previously approved programs and approval to award the Master in Business Administration and Master of

Education in Interdisciplinary Studies in Curriculum and Instruction degrees at its site in Northern Virginia.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants the University of Oklahoma approval to award a Master of Public Administration degree at a new site at Quantico Marine Base for a two-year term ending on January 19, 2001.

Decisions of the Director:

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council of Higher Education reflect the action of the director in recognizing the religious exemption of El Bethel Bible Institute, Unique Bible Institute, and Cambridge Institute of Theology and authorizing the use of the name Patrick Henry College.

LIAISON REPORT

Dr. Schilling reported that the staff continues work on the General Education Study. He indicated that the report would be sent to Council members by the end of the month. The Council will discuss the report at the March meeting. He reported on Dr. Allen's presentation on the General Education Report at the Blue Ribbon Commission Meeting. He stated that a copy of the presentation is available on SCHEV's web site.

He also reported that work continues on finalizing the document regarding decentralization of program approval. He stated that the draft would enhance the accountability measures to be more specific than in earlier drafts. He indicated that the document would be ready for discussion at the March meeting.

PROGRAM APPROVAL

Dr. Anderson reviewed with the Committee the proposal by Mary Washington to initiate a Bachelor of Professional Studies in the fall of 1999. She indicated that the proposed program would have tracks in computer technology and leadership management. Dr. Anderson stated that the new program differs from others at Mary Washington by its emphasis on development of workplace skills. The program will be taught at Mary Washington's new Stafford Campus.

The Committee accepted the staff recommendation for approval. The Council will act on the proposal at the March Council meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

RESPECTUFLY SUBMITTED:

Pamela H. Landrum, Secretary

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P2
Action on program proposal**

Subject:

Mary Washington's College's proposal to initiate a Bachelor of Professional Studies (B.P.S.) program (CIP 30.9999) in fall 1999.

Background:

Formal planning has been underway at Mary Washington College for the past ten years toward the establishment of a second campus. The purpose of the new campus is to offer quality programs that provide full-time and part-time lifelong learning opportunities for the area's nontraditional students and baccalaureate degree-completion opportunities for students with community college associate degrees. The new campus will allow the expansion of offerings beyond the scope of the liberal arts curriculum to provide an economic development curriculum.

Mary Washington College proposes a program in Professional Studies that will have tracks in computer technology and leadership and management. The program will be housed at Mary Washington College's new Stafford Campus, which is scheduled to open in fall 1999.

This program differs from others at Mary Washington College by its emphasis on development of direct workplace skills. Entering students will have an associate degree or its equivalent in coursework. Since Mary Washington anticipates that most of the students in this program will be employed, it anticipates offering most classes for this program in the evenings and on weekends.

In the Council's discussion of this program at its February 1999 meeting, Mary Washington College agreed to provide data on the projected utilization of the building in which this program will be located. The first building at the Stafford site will open in August 1999. The building has three computer classrooms, two teleconferencing rooms and eleven classrooms. Initially, programs offered at Stafford will primarily be in the early mornings, evenings, and weekends. In addition to the new baccalaureate degree completion programs, the college will expand offerings to teachers in computer technology and in incorporating standards of learning into the curriculum. Courses and programs from other state institutions will be offered at this site, including graduate engineering, master of business administration, and master of public administration. The pilot project Mary Washington is conducting with the Southern Regional Educational Board will allow courses and programs from other states to be offered as necessary. The college

anticipates continued growth over the next several years. Initially, the college projects that 40% of the classroom space will be utilized. In 2000, that goal will be 60%, in 2001 it will be 75%, and capacity would be reached in 2002.

Action Needed:

Council Approval.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

The staff's analysis is attached.

Fiscal Notes:

The General Assembly appropriated \$500,000 in the 1998-2000 biennium in operating funds and positions for the Stafford site and \$1,000,000 in Equipment Trust Funds. These resources will provide funding for the initiation of this program.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to Mary Washington College to initiate a Bachelor of Professional Studies (B.P.S.) program (CIP 30.9999) in fall 1999.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education grants approval to Mary Washington College to initiate a Bachelor of Professional Studies (B.P.S.) program (CIP 30.9999) in fall 1999.

MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE

Program title: Professional Studies

Degree to be offered: B.P.S.

CIP code: 30.9999

Projected implementation date: Fall 1999

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

In 1988, the Board of Visitors of Mary Washington College began discussing the feasibility of establishing a satellite campus to better meet the baccalaureate and master's degree needs of the adult population in the region. The Board explored several options and in late 1989, the Stafford County Board of Supervisors and the County Administrator notified the President of the availability of acreage that had been dedicated for higher education purposes as part of agreements reached with two developers. On February 17, 1990, the Board of Visitors authorized the President of the College to establish a satellite campus in Stafford, Virginia.

Although, the Stafford campus is administratively and operationally dependent upon the Fredericksburg Campus of Mary Washington College, its degree offerings will be tailored to the needs of residents and businesses within commuting radius. The mission of the Stafford campus is to offer quality programs that provide full-time and part-time lifelong learning opportunities for the area's nontraditional students and baccalaureate degree-completion opportunities for students with community college associate degrees. The new campus also will allow the expansion of offerings beyond the scope of the liberal arts curriculum to provide additional educational and economic development opportunities.

Mary Washington College proposes a program in Professional Studies that will have tracks in computer technology and leadership and management. The former will prepare students to develop, adapt, and use computer programs and systems; and the latter will provide active, collaborative, hands-on and experiential learning in leadership and management. Mary Washington College's mission stresses the importance of the 'principles of liberal learning' and a sound education to 'develop the skills necessary for creative and productive lives.' The Bachelor of Professional Studies will bring this tradition of excellence to the Stafford campus through its combination of a liberal learning professional studies core curriculum and its emphasis on education and skills necessary for the workplace. The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies, in which the program will be located, is an integral part of Mary Washington College and provides resources, services, and facilities to the college and surrounding community.

Mary Washington College is in full compliance with Description 1.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A, A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

MWC plans a 120 credit hour, four-year Bachelor of Professional Studies program. Admission to undergraduate study at Mary Washington College is handled through the central admissions office. Applicants must have an associate degree or equivalent credit hours with a minimum 2.0 grade point average. Transfer students who have earned an associate degree (AA, AS, AA&S) before matriculation at MWC will be considered to have met lower-division general education requirements. Students who have earned general studies or applied associate degrees must meet specific general-education requirements in English, natural sciences, math, and communication arts. Students in the program must maintain a grade point average of 2.0.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 2.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

MWC's proposed program will have a core of 18 credits, a 30 credit hour concentration, and 12 credits in electives. Students will transfer the remaining hours from a four-year institution or from associate degree programs. Essentially all of the courses in the program are new, although some will be cross-listed with other programs, primarily Mary Washington's existing programs in computer science and business management. The professional core courses will cover communications; ethics and contemporary legal issues; applied research methods; computer ethics and security; and technology, innovation and change. Following completion of the professional core, students must select a 30-credit concentration in either computer technology or leadership and management. The college's proposal clearly defines the program and the courses required for it.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 3.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

MWC's goal for the program is to produce graduates with technical skills and competencies so that they may assume or continue positions in the fields of business and computer technology. More specifically, MWC plans to produce individuals who upon completion of the program have the ability to: develop analytical and reasoning skills; 2) communicate verbally and in writing; 3) analyze the principles of ethical and legal issues as they apply in the workplace; 4) develop research skills; 5) emulate teachers in the field; and 6) use knowledge learned from a concentration area.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

This is not an existing program, so compliance with Description 5 is not at issue.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

This is not a collaborative program, so compliance is not at issue.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

The proposed program in professional studies is designed for delivery on-campus, although it will use technological tools such as on-line courses, independent study courses, telecourses, e-mail, video conferencing, simulations through interactive video, computer labs, modular classrooms, teleconference classrooms, and Network Virginia, all of which will allow for flexibility in learning times and places due to varying schedules. The flexibility of the program will meet the needs of both part-time and full-time students. Detailed syllabi and schedules will accompany all delivery systems. In addition, public television station WNVT will relocate from northern Virginia to the Stafford campus, and that station may play a role in certain course offerings.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 7.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vita for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

Mary Washington College projected that it will need five FTE faculty positions for program initiation. The college has advertised for these positions and has hired two faculty members for it. The college will advertise for and hire three more faculty after the program is approved. During the following year, the program will need six FTE full-time faculty positions and 5.2 part-time faculty positions. Mary Washington expects that the part-time faculty primarily will be professionals working in either computer technology or business, and who will teach one or two courses a year, depending upon their special knowledge and the program's needs. Duties for full-time faculty consist of teaching courses, advising students, recruiting and marketing courses, assessing the program, and developing and delivering courses in nontraditional formats.

The individuals selected for the positions must possess: 1) a terminal degree in an appropriate field, 2); 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and a master's degree or the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline; and 3) two years of college level teaching experience or work experience in business or industry. The faculty selected thus far meet these qualifications.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 8.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

The academic advising program for the proposed program is one that provides guidance for students and training programs for faculty. The college's Advising Center will assign each student a faculty mentor and will provide academic advising to all students enrolled in the program. The Center also will provide individualized pre-admission interviews, general information sessions, conduct transcript analyses for students, assist in assessment of student portfolios, and monitor students experiencing academic difficulty.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 9.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

The program expects that the majority of applicants will consist of adults who are currently employed. Graduates of this program will obtain positions as business managers, computer technologists, programmers, information management

technologists, and program system analysts. Graduates who do not wish to enter the world of work will possess the skills to pursue graduate study in human resources, information systems, public administration, and management.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 10.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

Programmatic accreditation is not applicable to this program.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies established several advisory committees consisting of professionals from local business, industry, public schools, community colleges, and governments to assist in the development of this program. The advisory committees included individuals who are potential employers of graduates, employers of potential students in the program, and community college faculty from the programs expected to be a source of students for this program. The advisory committees provided input into the development of the proposed program and will continue to serve as a resource that will suggest improvements and assist in the development of a strategic plan for the direction of the program based on business and governmental concerns.

MWC is in full compliance with Description 12.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

Clinical facilities are not applicable.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting enrollments, job placement and satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

The program's learning goals are listed in the previous section. The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies will implement an assessment plan that is consistent with MWC's assessment program. The college will assess student learning outcomes, faculty, curriculum, facilities, and program outcomes. The college will assess student's attainment of program goals primarily through the capstone course or senior project. The capstone course entitled Technology, Innovation, and Change, requires a media supported oral presentation and a written report that will be evaluated by faculty and external reviewers, most likely members of the program's advisory committee. The project presentation is designed so that students will demonstrate competency in the program's learning goals.

In addition to the senior project, the college will use student evaluations of teachers and courses, alumni surveys that document professional accomplishments and career development activities, employer surveys, placement data of graduates, and exit questionnaires to measure the various components of the program. The college expects that at least 75% of students and employers will be satisfied or highly satisfied with the program and that 80% of the projected enrollment will be met. If these expectations are not met, the college plans to eliminate a concentration, make other curricular changes, adjust staffing and resources, and take other actions to insure the success of the program.

MWC is in compliance with Evaluation 1 and 2.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

MWC projects the following estimated headcount and FTE for the proposed program in professional studies for the years 1999-2003.

<u>1999 – 2000</u>		<u>2000-2001</u>		<u>2001 – 2002</u>		<u>2002-2003</u>	
HDCT	FTEs	HDCT	FTEs	HDCT	FTEs	HDCT	FTEs
250	100	400	160	550	220	700	280

The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies at Mary Washington College expects that the projected enrollment will consist of adult students transferring from community colleges and four-year institutions. Due to the nature of the program, the college does not expect to attract many students from other programs offered by Mary Washington. To justify its projected student demand, the Center for Graduate and Professional Studies commissioned Mid-Atlantic Research, Inc. of Williamsburg to conduct a market study. Mid-Atlantic Research, Inc. conducted a quantitative telephone survey of 3,930 residents living within an approximate 30-mile radius of the Stafford campus. Of this group, 2,797 were asked detailed questions about their educational plans. The results of the survey revealed that 76% of those responding expected to earn a four-year degree. Further, the study recommended that business and computer science should become central to the Stafford campus and that cooperative ventures with major employers and other educational institutions should be considered.

In 1997, the college conducted a second survey of 343 community college graduates and area employers to determine demand for the proposed program in professional studies. Of those surveyed, 36% stated that they would be very likely to consider enrolling in the management and leadership concentration, while 25% indicated that they would be very likely to consider enrolling in the computer technology concentration.

The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies will develop a comprehensive plan for recruiting underrepresented groups which will include: community college, business, high school, and military visits, brochures, targeted mailings, and other forms of advertisements. College records indicate that 29% of MWC's adult students are from underrepresented groups. The gender and racial mix of students in the professional studies program is anticipated to be similar to that of MWC. The college provides an academic advising system, tutoring, and study skills seminars for students needing additional service.

MWC has fully justified the student demand for the program and is in full compliance with Justification 1.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

In 1996, the Fredericksburg Area Business Higher Education Council developed a strategic plan in response to the Regional Competitive Act. The plan describes developing a technologically world-class workforce which:

must insure that appropriate training and educational opportunities are available for our children and for our existing workforce. As the workforce, and the needs of new companies looking at our region for possible location, transitions to a more technical orientation, our educational system must be ready to provide the workforce needed to satisfy the demand for qualified labor. If this is not done, we will lose prospects and existing companies to areas in which a workforce with these skill levels is available. At all levels of education; from elementary to high school; from higher educational and post-high school technical training, we must be able to train our workforce to meet the needs of our employers.

Providing new training programs at all educational levels is not sufficient to meet the changing needs of businesses and industry. That would only be a short-term response. There must be a long-term and on-going integration of education, workforce training and business to insure that as the needs change an appropriate response will always be possible. Of greater need is the ability of our educational system to anticipate the changing needs of our workforce and to be proactive in meeting the demands of labor. This

can be accomplished by having an educational community that is knowledgeable in the processes and needs of the business community. This can be developed over time, but our regional educational systems must begin planning now for this type of integration.

The Bachelor of Professional Studies is responding to the Fredericksburg Area Business Higher Education Council's strategic plan. The partnership between the educational community, the business sector, and the government sector will improve regional cooperation and will allow this program to be flexible and responsive to the changing needs of business and the workforce. In the recently published Building a Commonwealth of Technology: A Blueprint for Technology-Based Economic Growth in Virginia (1997),

Virginia's technology sector is already growing at more than three times the rate of the Commonwealth's overall economy. Moreover, since the sector is highly linked to the rest of the economy, additional technology sector jobs are producing jobs in the rest of the economy on almost a one-to-one basis.

Mary Washington believes that its tracks in computer technology and leadership and management can assist with preparation of individuals for this job sector.

The Center for Graduate and Professional Studies conducted a survey of 35 local-area prospective employers, each of which employ at least 500 people in the fields of technology, utilities, military, health care, and financial sales. Forty-eight percent of the employers responded to the survey. Of those responding, 72% ranked the proposed program as "very good" or "excellent", 55% indicated that they would encourage their staff to enroll in the leadership and management major, 93% indicated that the concentrations appeared appropriate in preparing current employees in their company with skills for advancement, and 83% reported that they would be interested in hiring a graduate with a concentration in leadership and management.

MWC has fully justified employer demand for the program and is in full compliance with Justification 2.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

Planning for the proposed program has been on going since 1993. Mary Washington provided staff support and additional resources in planning the program. In its initial year, the college projects that it will need 5 FTE full-time instructional faculty positions, 2.4 FTE part-time instructional faculty and 2 clerical positions. The college projects that it will need 5 FTE full-time instructional faculty positions, 5.2 FTE part-time faculty positions, and 2 clerical positions by the year 2001. The costs for the program are shown below.

	Initiation year 1999-2000	Second year 2000-2001	Full enrollment 2001-2002
Full-time faculty	296,530	355,836	355,836
Part-time faculty	48,000	104,000	104,000
Classified staff	51,916	51,916	51,916
Subtotal	396,446	511,752	511,752
Fringe benefits	90,191	116,424	116,424
Total personnel	486,637	628,176	628,176
Equipment	131,250	67,500	67,500
Library	45,000	20,000	20,000
Telecommunications	12,000	12,000	12,000
Supplies	20,000	30,000	30,000
Total	\$694,887	\$757,676	\$757,676

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

The General Assembly appropriated in the 1998-2000 biennium \$500,000 for operating costs and positions and \$1,000,000 in Equipment Trust Fund funds for opening of the Stafford campus. In addition, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the Center for Graduate and Professional studies reallocated existing resources for the program.

The staff believes that MWC has fully described the sources of operational funds for the program, has an adequate plan for funding it, and is in compliance with Resources Needs 3. This does not affect considerations of deferred maintenance.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

The program will be offered at Mary Washington College's new Stafford campus, which is located about eight miles from its main campus. The campus, which was approved and funded by the General Assembly, is scheduled to open

this fall. The Bachelor of Professional Studies program will be the campus' main program. MWC also will offer other programs, such as the Bachelor of Liberal Studies and Master of Arts in Liberal Studies, at that campus.

MWC is in full compliance with Resource Needs 4.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P3-A
Program proposal**

Subject:

George Mason University's proposal to initiate a Master of Science in Health Systems Management program (CIP 51.0701) in fall 1999.

Background:

In spring 1997, George Mason University's College of Nursing and Health Sciences began offering, within the University's Master of Sciences program in New Professional Studies, a specialty track that provided an educational program for physicians and other health professionals who wanted to further their preparation in health systems management. A group of eight students completed the program in fall 1998. Their response to the program was very positive except that they wanted to have a degree designation that more clearly reflected the program's content. In response, the College of Nursing and Health Sciences prepared a proposal for a separate program, the Master of Science program in Health Systems Management. In the meantime, approximately 15 students are taking currently offered courses that apply to the proposed program and are awaiting the Council's action on the initiation of the program. These students meet the University's admission criteria for the program and will be admitted to it if the program is approved.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Approval.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

Staff analysis attached.

Fiscal Notes:

George Mason University's College of Nursing and Health Sciences will reallocate the resources necessary for this program.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to George Mason University for initiation of a Master of Science (M.S.) in Health Systems Management program (CIP 51.0701) in fall 1999.

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

Program title: Health Systems Management

Degree to be offered: M.S.

CIP code: 51.0701

Projected implementation date: Fall 1999

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

Beginning in spring 1997, George Mason University's College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) offered a health systems management track within the university's Master of Science in New Professional Studies. The eight students who graduated in fall 1998 strongly support the program with the exception of its name. The University proposes to modify that track so that it is a separate program, the Master of Science in Health Systems Management.

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences offers B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. programs in nursing and is the home of the Center for Health Policy and Ethics, the Institute for Post Graduate Health Science, Professional Development Programs, and the Center for Data Analysis and Research Outcomes. The college cooperates extensively with the Inova Hospital System and George Washington University. In 1991, the World Health Organization (WHO) named George Mason University's College of Nursing and Health Sciences as one of the 14 U.S. colleges affiliated with it. The college conducts nursing, interdisciplinary, and health science international programs through the WHO.

The M.S. in Health Systems Management program provides students with the skills and tools to serve as leaders and executives in the health industry in the metropolitan Washington D.C. area. The interdisciplinary curriculum integrates concepts from business management, economics, public health, organizational behavior, information technology, social psychology, public policy, and law.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 1.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A, A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

Students in the track that completed in fall 1998 were drawn from the health industry in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area and future students will come from the same source. Since the program is designed for experienced, working health-care professionals with a record of accomplishment in academic studies, the program prefers applicants with at least three years of management experience. Other admission criteria are similar to other master's programs at GMU. Students may enroll on a part or full time basis.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 2.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

George Mason University plans a 40-credit, part-time program during which students will take two courses a semester for four semesters and two summers. All students will take five core courses and seven additional courses. The CNHS designed the core courses with an emphasis on systems, continuous quality improvement, information technology, and law and ethics as they apply to leadership and improvement of health systems. The other courses focus on how services are provided across institutions and levels of care, management skills, and the non-traditional orientation of integrated managed care.

Ten of the courses in the program were designated specifically for this program, while one is offered by the University's public administration program and the other is cross-listed with nursing. Other degree programs, for instance the Master of Business Administration, the Master of Public Administration, and the Master of Science in Information Systems, use several of the courses as electives. The course descriptions supplied for the program each have specific learning objectives that cover the range of topics described in Description 1. All courses currently are offered in the existing health systems management track.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 3.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

The 40-credit curriculum is designed to prepare graduates with an understanding of the larger socio-political and economic context in which health systems and health policy exist. The University listed nine competencies within the areas of analysis, action, and interpersonal competence. More specifically, the program will prepare working professionals with knowledge, skills, and abilities to make health systems more efficient through better management and alignment of

financial resources. Learners will create linkages and alignment between the public and private sectors. From a community focus, graduates will explore how to design seamless systems of clinical care that provide a full continuum of services, and manage or analyze systems based on the outcomes.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

The proposed curriculum has four courses that differ from that of the track within the M.S. in New Professional Studies program. The University believes it needs to be a separate program in order to build a proper identity and to provide appropriate credentials and stronger preparation for its graduates. Both students and employers requested the separation of this track into a stand-alone program.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 5.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

This program is sponsored solely by GMU.

Compliance with Description 6 is not an issue.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

GMU will deliver the program on campus and in health-care agencies, and will offer some courses on-line or through distance-learning technologies. Internet assignments, dialogues among students through "chat rooms" for courses, and simulations through interactive video will be incorporated into each course. Since the program is designed primarily for part-time students, the CNHS planned its

scheduling and advising for them. Core courses will be offered during the day and evening. Courses will be scheduled based on enrolled students' preferences and according to program sequencing. Local hospitals requested that GMU offer the program in their locations, and upon approval of the program, GMU plans to contract with these agencies for these courses.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 7.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vita for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

George Mason University submitted brief descriptions of faculty who taught in the health systems management track and who will teach in the proposed program. GMU will recruit and hire one more full-time faculty member whose responsibilities will be split between this program and the college's nursing program. The University expects to continue to hire adjunct faculty to teach some specific courses. The faculty have appropriate credentials for teaching in the program.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 8.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

The CNHS at GMU assigns each student to a faculty member for advising purposes. The student and the faculty member jointly develop the student's learning plan. The relatively small number of students in the program allows faculty to know students well and to provide advising for them. Since students in the program will be working professionals and since students have little selection among the courses in the program, essentially all students will take the same program, making course advising very simple.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 9.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

The program is designed to improve the skills and knowledge of working individuals. The University designed the program specifically to meet employment needs in the greater Washington D.C. area. Graduates of the track reported that the program met their needs in continuing their education.

GMU is in compliance with Description 10.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

GMU will seek accreditation from the Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration. This accreditation agency is similar to others in that GMU cannot apply for accreditation before it has graduated at least one class of students. George Mason University plans to apply for accreditation in 2001 when the first class graduates. The university designed its curriculum to meet the standards of the accrediting agency.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 11.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences has an advisory committee for this program. Composed of 10 executives, primarily from large metropolitan Washington D.C. employers, the advisory committee worked with program faculty in the development of this proposal and supports the proposal.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 12.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

GMU has signed contracts with 37 hospitals and other health-care agencies in the metropolitan Washington D.C. area to provide internship or practicum experiences to students in this program. GMU will assign no more than one student to any agency at any time. The cooperating agencies have agreed to provide 1:1 student-supervisor ratios for the internships.

GMU is in full compliance with Description 13.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting targets for enrollment, job placement, satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

GMU provided a detailed matrix describing the evaluation plan for the College of Nursing and Health Science. Included in this plan are provisions for assessing student learning outcomes in this program, including obtaining feedback from students, graduates, and employers about the effectiveness of the program.

GMU is in full compliance with Program Evaluation 1 and 2.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

In summer 1995, GMU's College of Nursing and Health Science, in collaboration with the Fairfax Hospital, conducted market research to identify the needs and interests of physicians for health-care management and business programs. The college believed the results compelling, for 100 of the 101 persons surveyed expressed an interest in continuing education, occasional courses, or a degree program. Forty of the 100 reported that they wanted a post-graduate degree in health-care management. They wanted a program that met their needs for a multi-disciplinary program with flexible hours, ease of enrollment, and "good teachers."

Based upon its experience while offering the track in health systems management within the University's M.S. in New Professional Studies, the College of Nursing and Health Sciences expects that it will enroll 25 headcount (6.25 FTE) students in fall 1999 and will increase that number each year for two years. When the program is fully enrolled, the college expects 35 headcount (8.75 FTE) students. Although most students will have significant employment experience, the program also provides graduate study opportunities for graduates of the College of Nursing and Health Sciences B.S. in Health Sciences program.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

The second largest employment sector in the greater Washington D.C. area is health care, with nearly 600 employers. Health-care managers are among the professionals with the highest employment demand, and the demand is expected to increase with the aging of the baby-boomer population. Nearly all anticipated students in the program are currently and will continue to be employed within the health sector. While some will remain in their current positions following graduation, others will have the preparation to move into higher-level or executive positions.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences will reallocate internally the resources needed to operate this program. It has named a program director, who will spend three-quarters of her time on this program and the remainder of it on the nursing programs. Several other existing faculty will each teach one course for this program, while allocating most of their time to the nursing programs. These faculty, who are full-time in the College of Nursing and Health Science, will contribute 0.75 FTE positions to the program, for a total of 1.5 faculty positions. An existing clerical staff member will spend one-quarter of her time on this program. The table that follows shows the costs for the program on a year-by-year basis. The College of Nursing and Health Science has adequate space for the program, and no renovation or additional space is needed for it.

	Program initiation 1999-2000	Second year 2000-2001	Full enrollment 2001-2002
Full-time faculty	85,000	89,250	89,250
Graduate assistants	7,500	7,875	7,875
Classified staff	8,750	9,188	9,188
Fringe benefits	19,779	20,768	20,768
Non-personnel costs	7,000	7,350	7,350
Totals	\$128,029	\$134,431	\$134,431

George Mason University is in full compliance with Resources 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P3-B
Program proposal**

Subject:

James Madison University's proposal to initiate a Master of Science in Integrated Science and Technology program (CIP 30.1501) in fall 2000.

Background:

In the late 1980's, James Madison University began planning for a new college, one that would prepare its graduates for the 21st century. Named the College of Integrated Science and Technology (CISAT), the college began with a vision that was embraced and funded by the Commonwealth. The College's first program, the Bachelor of Science in Integrated Science and Technology began in fall 1993. CISAT now serves as home to the university's health programs as well as its science and technology program.

Planning for a graduate program in Integrated Science and Technology began before the undergraduate program was approved. The current submission is the second one for a graduate program in Integrated Science and Technology. The first proposal, submitted in September 1996, was returned by SCHEV staff suggesting that more time was needed to assess the undergraduate integrated science and technology degree. Since 1996, the undergraduate program has had two graduating classes and all graduating seniors who desired employment gained professional employment with many accepting offers prior to their graduation. The average starting salary for the two graduating classes was \$40,000 and about 10% of the graduates attended graduate school.

James Madison University proposes a masters program that offers a solid foundation in applied science and technology. The program prepares students to address complex, interdisciplinary problems common in today's business world. The curriculum stresses the use of computers for modeling, simulation, and management of information and knowledge. James Madison University's program in integrated science and technology will build on existing programmatic strengths while addressing regional workforce issues.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council approval.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

Staff analysis attached.

Fiscal Notes:

James Madison University plans to initiate this program in fall 2000. In its budget request for the 2000-2002 biennium, James Madison University plans to request positions and funding for this program.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to James Madison University for initiation of a Master of Science in Integrated Science and Technology program (CIP 30.1501) in fall 2000.

JAMES MADISON UNIVERSITY

Program title: Integrated Science and Technology

Degree to be offered: M.S.

CIP code: 30.1501

Projected implementation date: Fall 2000

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

James Madison University is a comprehensive regional university that seeks to address the needs of the Commonwealth, as a whole and its western region in particular. One aspect of its mission is to provide a comprehensive and quality undergraduate educational, cultural and social experience for its students.

In 1993, the University initiated an undergraduate program in Integrated Science and Technology, and that program now has graduated two classes of students. These graduates have been very successful in gaining employment in a variety of highly technical fields, and received average salaries above graduates from JMU's other schools. A 1996 proposal to initiate this program was discouraged by the Council's staff and withdrawn by James Madison because assessment data were not then available on the undergraduate program. Those data, including the employment data, are very positive.

James Madison University now proposes a Master of Science in Integrated Science And Technology that will build upon its undergraduate program and will provide a broad, project-based education for careers that have a strong science and technology component. The goal of the program is to provide graduates with the intellectual tools to understand the strategic connections among the sciences, technology, and the problems of society. The proposed program builds upon the undergraduate integrated science and technology program and both programs are designed to provide opportunities for students who seek professional careers that require integration of scientific, technological, managerial and social issues. The College of Integrated Science and Technology, in which the program will be located, is an integral part of James Madison University and provides resources, services, and facilities to the college and surrounding community.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 1.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A, A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

JMU proposes a 30-credit master's program. A student successfully completing an average of 12 credit hours per semester will complete the program in two semesters and one summer session. Admission to James Madison University is handled through the Graduate School. Admission to the proposed program may be granted to students with undergraduate experiences typically in the physical, biological, and social sciences; computer science, education, mathematics, engineering, and operations research; and management, economics, and information and decision sciences. Additionally, entering students must have completed 15 credits in the natural sciences and mathematics at the undergraduate level. Students who do not satisfy this requirement may be required to complete prerequisite courses. Admissions decisions will be collectively based on graduation from a regionally accredited college or university, undergraduate grade point average, test scores from Graduate Record Exam, official transcripts from all colleges or universities attended and industrial, business or educational experience as indicated by current vita. In special cases, an interview process may be used to make a final decision on admittance.

A maximum of nine credits of transfer courses may be considered for inclusion in the student's program of study upon the approval of the master's degree program coordinator and the Dean of the Graduate School. A grade of "B" or better must be earned in courses requested for transfer credit. Courses taken for pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory will not be accepted for transfer credit. An official transcript showing the credits approved for transfer must be forwarded to the Graduate School. Continuation in the program will be contingent upon maintaining a grade point average of 3.0 or better, with no more than six credits of C's.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 2.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

JMU's proposed program will have a common integrated science and technology core of 12 to 15 credits, 6 credits in a specific strategic area, 3 to 6 graduate elective credits approved by the advisor, and 6 credits of capstone project or thesis research. The strategic areas are 1) Biotechnology, 2) Energy Systems,

3) Engineering/ Manufacturing, 4) Environment, 5) Information and Knowledge Management, and 6) Social Context of Science and Technology. Essentially, all of the courses for the program are new. The integrated science and technology core courses will cover foundations in integrated science and technology; social context of science and technology; research methods in a multidisciplinary environment; computer modeling and simulation; and information and knowledge management. Students will be required to complete a six-credit capstone project or thesis. This project or thesis will involve research, investigation, and development undertaken by students individually and/or as part of project teams. Individual course plans and schedules vary depending on a student's background, course availability, and area of concentration.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 3.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

JMU's goal for the program is to produce graduates who have knowledge and skills so that upon graduation, they may assume positions in science and technology. More specifically, JMU plans to produce graduates who have the ability to: 1) integrate information and concepts across different scientific disciplines; 2) perform research and clearly communicate the results; 3) apply systems-analysis concepts and methodologies in problem formation and solution; 4) use the computer in communication, information and knowledge management, modeling, and decision making; 5) work effectively with people with diverse backgrounds; and 6) demonstrate an understanding of the social, legal, and ethical contexts of technology.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

Compliance with Description 5 is not applicable.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

This is not a collaborative program and compliance is not an issue.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

The proposed program in integrated science and technology is designed for delivery on-campus, although it will use technological tools such as on-line courses, telecourses, and the Internet. The flexibility of the program will meet the needs of both part-time and full-time students.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 7.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vita for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

The college projects that when its program is initiated, it will need 2.6 FTE faculty positions, including 2.2 FTE faculty and .4 FTE part-time faculty. The college identified twenty-six faculty who represent a multidisciplinary group of professionals with disciplines ranging broadly from engineering and science to philosophy and political science and who will serve as core faculty. Upon approval of the program, the positions will be advertised and filled. During the second year, the program will need 2.5 FTE faculty and .5 FTE part-time faculty.

Faculty selected for the integrated science and technology program should have an earned Ph.D. The college also prefers that the applicants have conducted extensive research. Duties consist of teaching courses, advising students, conducting students, and conducting research.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 8.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

Upon acceptance to the program, the college will assign a faculty advisor for each student to in the student's area of interest. Both formal and informal advising will occur in face-to-face contact during the student's time on campus and through telephone and e-mail contact during each semester.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 9.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

Coursework in the program will focus on specialized areas in biotechnology, energy systems, engineering/manufacturing, environment, information and knowledge management, and social context of science and technology. Each of these specializations was developed in conjunction with the program's advisory committee to ensure that they meet the needs of employers.

The program expects that applicants will consist of adults who are currently employed and graduates of programs in the physical, biological, social sciences, computer science, education, mathematics, engineering, operations research, management, economics, and information and decision sciences. Graduates of this program will obtain positions as management consultants, systems engineers, production managers, technology managers, manufacturing engineers, quality engineers, health systems analysts, system/program analysts, marketing specialists, environmental specialists, safety engineers, scientific consultants, information systems consultants, and project managers.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 10.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

Programmatic accreditation is not applicable to this program. But, upon approval of the program, the University will submit a Substantive Change Procedure to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

In 1993, the College of Integrated Science and Technology established an Executive Advisory Council of professionals to assist the college in strategic planning and resource issues. The advisory council consists of individuals who are potential employers of the graduates of the program. The council offered input into the development of the proposed program and will continue to serve as a resource that will participate in the evaluation and assessment of the program and assist in insuring quality and relevance in the program. The Executive Advisory Council is a proactive element for the college in searching for potential financial and programmatic support through foundations, government agencies, and industry. Membership on the Executive Advisory Council is chosen from individuals at the highest executive level within organizations having interest in the mission of the

College of Integrated Science and Technology.

JMU is in full compliance with Description 12.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

Clinical facilities are not applicable for this program.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting enrollments, job placement and satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

The program's learning goals are listed in the previous section. The College of Integrated Science and Technology will implement an assessment plan that is consistent with JMU's assessment program. The college will assess students, faculty, curriculum, facilities, and program outcomes. A battery of assessment instruments will be administered to students at the beginning and end of their graduate program. These instruments will assess the capabilities of the students under each of the program's learning goals. The college will assess student's attainment of program goals through a capstone project or thesis. The degree candidate will develop a project or thesis with an emphasis on his or her designated strategic area and integrated with at least one other area, for completion of the final requirements. The project or thesis will report the results of original research, investigation, and development undertaken by the student individually and/or as part of a project team. Work on the project will be supervised by an advisor(s), a member of the graduate faculty in the college. Faculty and external reviewers who serve on the program's advisory committee will evaluate the project. The project presentation is designed so those students will demonstrate competency in the program's learning goals.

In addition to the capstone project, the college will use student evaluations of teachers and courses, alumni surveys that document professional

accomplishments and career activities, employer surveys, placement data of graduates, and exit questionnaires to measure the various components of the program.

JMU is in compliance with Evaluation Criteria 1 and 2.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

JMU projects the following estimated headcount and FTE for the proposed program in professional studies for the years 2000-2006.

2000-2001		2001-2002		2002-2003		Target Year 2005-2006	
<u>HDCT</u>	<u>FTEs</u>	<u>HDCT</u>	<u>FTEs</u>	<u>HDCT</u>	<u>FTEs</u>	<u>HDCT</u>	<u>FTEs</u>
30	22	35	25	40	30	100	65

The College of Integrated Science and Technology expects that the projected enrollment will consist of adult students who are currently employed in technology-intensive industries, graduates from the undergraduate integrated science and technology program, and graduates from other programs. The projected enrollment for the program is also based on the popularity of the current undergraduate program in integrated science and technology and the strong show of support from a growing list of satisfied customers representing both graduates and their employers. Five years ago, 65 students enrolled in the first undergraduate class. In the fall of 1998, 250 freshmen enrolled bringing the total number of majors to over 750. The college has received numerous inquiries about the proposed program from undergraduate students, graduates of other programs, and companies showing interest in the undergraduate program.

The master's program in integrated science and technology is clearly non-

traditional when measured against the offerings in traditional engineering, systems engineering, management, or the traditional sciences. It is positioned differently than these programs with respect to the diversity of academic backgrounds of students targeted and the type of outcome desired. The program will attract students with an inclination toward a breadth of studies rather than depth in a particular area. It also will offer a powerful option for students interested in the fields of modeling and simulation, systems analysis, and the studies of intelligent systems.

The ISAT program is not intended or expected significantly to impact enrollments in traditional scientific and technical areas. However, it will provide an opportunity for students who have been educated in traditional programs to supplement and broaden their scientific and technical training. It will also provide an opportunity for traditional and non-traditional students to seek careers in the many supporting functions at the interface of science, technology, and the issues of contemporary society.

Women and minority students have been historically underrepresented in science and technology-related majors in higher education. School records indicate that in the graduate biology program, 33.3% of the students are minorities and 44.4% are women. Records also indicate that in the computer science program, 10.7% are minorities and 16% are women.

The College of Integrated Science and Technology will develop a comprehensive plan for recruiting underrepresented groups which will include: targeted program announcements and mailings to school districts, universities, and 100 government and industrial organizations and conducting on-site recruiting and information fairs at industrial facilities and graduate schools.

JMU has justified the student demand for the program and is in full compliance with Justification 1.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

The September 1995 issue of *Fortune* magazine reported that the best jobs for growth in the future are home health care, computer software, management consulting, and public relations. Furthermore, in 1997, the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicated that employment in the professional specialty group and the

executive, administrative and managerial occupations would increase the fastest (26.6% and 17.2%, respectively) and add the most jobs (7.6 million, combined) from 1996 to 2006. These two occupational classes (which include engineering, management and science professionals) represent the target student market for the master's program in integrated science and technology. In addition, nearly 70% of the growth in professional specialty occupations will be among teachers, computer and quantitative practitioners, as well as health assessment and treatment occupations.

The *1995 Career Management Report* outlined the most promising career opportunities in the next decade. The study listed the following opportunities for job seekers, each of which describes one or more of the characteristics of the integrated science and technology program:

Whether it is a first job or the next step in an established professional career, four industries will offer the best employment opportunities in the decade ahead: health care, engineering, environment, and high technology.

Technical professionals will be sought to fill acute shortages of workers in technical specialties.

A marriage of two hot career areas, engineering and environment, is dramatically enhancing job opportunities for environmental engineers. Companies are scrambling for professionals who can guide them through the growing maze of federal and state regulatory requirements.

High tech jobs will grow at twice the rate of all occupations over the foreseeable future. Industries with the greatest opportunities include telecommunications, biotechnology, computers and telecommunications.

The U. S. Department of commerce reported that the development and use of technologies remains a driving force for U. S. economic prosperity and national security. Maintaining the strength and competitiveness of U. S. technological enterprises, therefore, continues to be vital. All are essential to economic prosperity or national security. Among these of the strategic technology areas included in this program are energy, environmental quality, information and communication, living systems, manufacturing, and materials.

JMU has justified employer demand for the program and is in full compliance with Justification 2.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

The College of Integrated Science and Technology reallocated part of a staff position to prepare the proposal for the program and do the detailed planning and curriculum development for it. Position needs for the program initiation, second year of operation, and full enrollment are shown below, and are consistent with the number of students the program expects to serve. The Graduate Teaching Assistants will assist faculty in their teaching responsibilities, and will supervise undergraduate students in laboratory experiences.

	Initiation year 2000-2001	Second year 2001-2002	Third year 2002-2003
Full-time faculty	2.2	2.5	3.0
Part-time faculty	0.4	0.5	0.6
Administrative faculty	1.0	1.0	1.0
Classified positions	1.4	1.6	1.9
Graduate Teaching Assistants.	2.8	3.2	3.8

In addition to personnel costs, the program will need funds for the cost of computers, telecommunications, supplies and software, library resources, office supplies, financial aid, travel, and recruiting and relocation costs for faculty. The costs for the program are shown on the next page.

	Initiation year 1999-2000	Second year 2000-2001	Third year 2001-2002
Full-time faculty	127,600	145,000	174,000
Part-time faculty	14,400	18,000	21,600
Program administrator	66,000	66,000	66,000
Classified positions	42,000	48,000	57,000
Graduate student asst.	77,616	88,704	105,336
Fringe benefits	62,181	68,671	78,998
Targeted financial aid	54,230	61,978	73,598
Computers/equipment	100,000	30,550	39,485
Library	80,000	80,000	80,000
Telecommunications	4,250	4,760	5,525
Software, supplies, travel, faculty recruitment, and miscellaneous	42,210	30,675	31,685
Total	\$670,487	\$642,338	\$733,227

JMU described the resources needed for operating the program and is in full compliance with Resources Needs 1 and 2.

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

James Madison University has not identified funds to support the proposal butt states that it will submit a budget request in the 2000-2002 biennium specifically for positions and funds for this program.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

Phase II of the College of Integrated Science and Technology is under construction with expected completion in fall 2000. This facility will provide 180,000 square feet to the college that will provide the needed space for the graduate program and additional space for the undergraduate program. With the opening of this building, JMU will have all the space it needs for this program.

JMU is in full compliance with Resources 4.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P3-C
Program proposal**

Subject:

The University of Virginia's proposal to initiate a Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (B.I.S.) in Interdisciplinary Studies program (CIP 30.9999) in fall 1999.

Background:

Until now, adult students in the Charlottesville area have been unable to complete an undergraduate degree at the University of Virginia, because the university's curriculum is structured so as to require full-time attendance, with graduation expected within a four-year timeframe. Graduates of surrounding community colleges (such as Piedmont Virginia Community College) who are employed in the area and even UVA's own employees who desire to continue their education on a part-time basis have had to commute to James Madison University, Mary Baldwin College, or other institutions. The University now proposes to offer a bachelor's degree program specifically intended for adult learners who have completed an associate's degree or 60 hours of college credit. Courses in the new program would be offered year round during evening and weekend hours, in order to accommodate the needs of students who are balancing careers, family responsibilities, and civic obligations. This program, which has been discussed and planned for the past year, would be an important part of UVA's efforts to reach out to the surrounding community.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Approval.

Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Materials:

Staff analysis attached.

Fiscal Notes:

The University of Virginia is providing start-up funds for the new program, which is expected to become entirely self-supporting through tuition revenues. (Budget projections contained in the proposal take into account the planned

rollback in undergraduate tuition.) No additional state funds are being requested.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to the University of Virginia for initiation of a Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (B.I.S.) in Interdisciplinary Studies program (CIP 30.9999) in fall 1999.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Program title: Interdisciplinary Studies

Degree to be offered: B.I.S.

CIP code: 30.9999

Projected implementation date: Fall 1999

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies is designed to open the doors of the University of Virginia to adult men and women who appreciate the value of a liberal arts education but who are unable to enroll in a traditional residential degree program at the university. Thomas Jefferson designed the University to educate the citizenry and especially its leaders. The central purpose of the University was then and has remained to enrich the mind by stimulating and sustaining a spirit of free inquiry directed to understanding the nature of the universe and the role of mankind in it. The University's official Statement of Purpose and Goals for 1998-99 includes "to offer instruction of the highest quality to undergraduates from all walks of life," to foster in students "a desire to engage in a lifetime of learning," and "to provide continuing education programs of the highest quality to the Commonwealth and the nation." The University's division of Continuing Education, which would administer the new degree, has long sought to create opportunities for adults to further their studies by drawing on the University's research and teaching strengths, although until now a degree program has not been available. In his *State of the University* address in March 1998, President John T. Casteen confirmed the University's commitment to public service and outreach and announced that the University would develop a part-time degree program for adults.

The University of Virginia has for many years offered a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies (CIP 24.0101) for its full-time, residential undergraduate students. That degree is restricted to students with at least a 3.4 GPA and is intended to allow existing students to design an individualized major by combining multiple disciplines (e.g., Psychobiology, Physical Anthropology, or Medical Ethics) under the direction of a committee of faculty from the respective disciplines. In spite of the similarity in name, the existing degree is quite different from the proposed degree.

Only students who have applied to the B.I.S. program and who have been awarded provisional admission or regular status may enroll in B.I.S. courses.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 1.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A, A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

Admission to the B.I.S. program involves a three-step process: (1) formal application; (2) provisional admission to the program; and (3) admission as a regular status student. In order to be provisionally admitted, applicants must have graduated from high school no fewer than six years before the time of first enrollment and have earned an associate's degree or completed at least 60 credit hours of college-level work, including at least 30 hours in a "liberal studies core" (the equivalent of general education courses). The credit hour requirements are essentially the same as for students who wish to transfer to UVA from another institution at the beginning of their third year of full-time study, with the exception that no foreign language is required.

Those intending to concentrate in Business must have completed five prerequisites (statistics, microeconomics, macroeconomics, financial accounting, and management accounting) before applying for admission. Similarly, those intending to concentrate in Information Technology must have completed three prerequisites (information technology, business computing, and probability/finite mathematics or calculus).

Depending upon academic performance in the "liberal studies core" (i.e., general education) courses, provisional admission will require that students complete a specified number of courses with a C or better in each course within three consecutive terms, in order to be admitted to regular status. In addition, students who receive provisional admission must demonstrate that they possess certain computer competencies within three consecutive terms. Those who have been provisionally admitted and who fail to meet these requirements will be dropped from the program.

In order to graduate, the B.I.S. candidate must have successfully completed all components of the specially designed B.I.S. curriculum and must present a total of 120 credit hours, at least 54 of which have been taken at the University of Virginia. At least 45 of the hours taken at UVA must have been completed on a graded (A-B-C-D) basis, with a 2.0 grade point average or higher. B.I.S. students would normally take from three to nine credit hours per term. Those who take 15 credit hours per year may expect to graduate after being enrolled at the University of Virginia for four years. (With fall 1999 initiation, the first class would graduate in spring 2003.) All B.I.S. students must complete their studies within six years of admission to regular status in the B.I.S. program.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 2.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

The curriculum for the B.I.S. degree has four components: (1) a series of three required Liberal Studies Seminars (two Critical Issues Seminars and one Analytical Skills Seminar) especially designed for the B.I.S. program (9 credit hours); (2) a minimum of 21 credit hours in upper division courses in one of four concentrations: Business, Humanities, Information Technology, and Social Sciences; (3) from 18 to 24 credit hours in elective courses; and (4) a three-credit Capstone Project, under the direction of a Faculty Mentor, which enables students to draw upon their educational experiences in a meaningful way by designing, developing, producing, and evaluating a major project.

The three required Liberal Studies Seminars and the Capstone Project would be new courses designed especially for this program. All of the courses in the four concentrations and all electives are existing courses that have already been through UVA's approval processes. B.I.S. students would take these courses in separate sections from other UVA undergraduate students, although the course content would be the same. This is primarily because the B.I.S. courses would be taught in evening and weekend classes, and UVA does not wish its full-time residential students to take courses at these times. Seats in classes scheduled for evenings and weekends would be reserved for B.I.S. students, who would be unable to take classes scheduled during traditional hours. Thus the separate scheduling meets the needs of both types of students.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 3.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

The curriculum of the B.I.S. program would have several components, each of which is designed to have specific learning outcomes. For example, among the three required liberal studies seminars, two are designed to enable students to sharpen their critical and analytical thinking skills, polish their writing, and develop expertise in oral communication. The third places emphasis on understanding and using methods of qualitative and quantitative analysis, including issues such as

understanding variability in data, making decisions in the face of uncertainty and presenting data to support an argument.

The B.I.S. curriculum also includes a computer component. In order to be admitted to regular status, students must demonstrate certain computer competencies:

Competency One:	An understanding of computer processing, retrieval and transmission, and storing technologies.
Competency Two:	An understanding of word processing.
Competency Three:	An understanding of how to develop and use spreadsheets.
Competency Four:	An understanding of how to develop and use databases.
Competency Five:	An understanding of how to access and use networks and global communications.
Competency Six:	An understanding of how to incorporate technology into presentations.

The following are among the learning objectives for the four B.I.S. concentrations in Business, the Humanities, Information Technology and the Social Sciences:

Business

- To introduce students to the concepts and processes of business and to the role of business organizations in a complex global economy
- To give students a sound general business foundation and the analytical and conceptual skills essential to understanding current accounting, finance, management, and marketing practices
- To develop a student's understanding of both the functional and analytical methods of business and finance, the functions of financial institutions and international capital markets, and the operation of the global financial system
- To examine the complexities of cross-border business transactions and the operations of organizations in home country and host country markets
- To develop the interpersonal, managerial, and organizational skills necessary to work and to manage in profit and not-for-profit organizations

- To enhance a student's awareness and understanding of the role of marketing in the firm and in society

Humanities

- To develop a sense of the internal logic of the humanities disciplines: literature, fine arts, philosophy, and religious studies
- To learn to appreciate and apply critical standards in the humanities disciplines
- To learn to differentiate between critical, historical, and aesthetic standards of judgement
- To learn to confront and assess major works of art and literature
- To understand the durable and the transient in the major historical traditions

Information Technology

- To examine the concepts, technologies, and tools of information technology used by business analysts and managers with applications across all functional areas of business
- To develop the knowledge and skills necessary to collect, to process, to store, and to use information in the business environment
- To prepare students to become effective systems analysts with developed proficiencies in state-of-the-art information technologies
- To develop skills in managing information resources of an organization, including analyzing database environments in organizations
- To develop proficiencies in building and using databases and application programs using contemporary database management software

Social Sciences

- To understand the differing perspectives of the social sciences disciplines: anthropology, economics, history, government, psychology, and sociology
- To understand the workings of complex human organizations
- To understand how to form law-like generalizations about human behavior
- To understand present realities in light of historical developments

- To understand how to make plausible projections of future trends
- To understand the difference between quantitative and qualitative explanations

As the B.I.S. curriculum becomes more fully developed, the B.I.S. Advisory Committee will work with the Office of Institutional Assessment and Studies and the B.I.S. faculty to specify more detailed learning goals and objectives for the program. Assessment of learning outcomes will be reviewed as part of UVA's established Program Review process.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

This is not a proposed restructuring of an existing program, so compliance with Description 5 is not at issue.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

While the University of Virginia has consulted with Piedmont Virginia Community College in the design of the proposed program and there is a PVCC representative on the Advisory Committee, it is not a collaborative program with any other institution.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

Classes in the B.I.S. program would be delivered through traditional methods and would not be telecommunicated from another source. Scheduling of courses would be undertaken with the aim of accommodating the needs of adult students who have full-time jobs. Each student who is admitted to the B.I.S. program would

be assigned an Academic Adviser, who would be responsible for working closely with the student on all aspects of his or her academic program. The staff of the B.I.S. office would provide advising on student services and other university support mechanisms, which would be made available during evening hours for the students.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 7.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vitae for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

The Advisory Committee (consisting of six regular UVA faculty members and one representative from PVCC) would review the credentials of all faculty selected to teach in the program and have authority for approval. Full-time faculty of the University would not constitute the primary source of B.I.S. faculty. Teaching faculty in the B.I.S. program would be drawn from a variety of sources, including full-time faculty of the University (with the approval of their deans), the General Faculty of the University, emeritus faculty, recent university Ph.D.'s, members of the community with requisite credentials and experience, and advanced graduate students lacking only a completed dissertation. All contracts with faculty teaching in the B.I.S. program would be on a term-to-term basis. Faculty would be compensated at an average rate of \$4,000 per course.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 8.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

Each student who is admitted to the B.I.S. program would be assigned an Academic Advisor. Academic Advisors would be approved by the Advisory Committee and would work closely with students to plan the program of study, to monitor student progress, and to provide advice on matters pertaining to B.I.S. academic policies and procedures.

Students would be required to meet with their Academic Advisors each term before enrolling in classes. Advisors must approve requests to take a course for credit outside the regular B.I.S. curriculum; they also must endorse student requests for leaves of absence. The Academic Advisor would assist the student in identifying a Faculty Mentor to work with the student on the Capstone Project that is undertaken near the completion of the B.I.S. degree program.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 9.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies program is designed to provide adult students with the same educational advantages afforded to other undergraduate students enrolled in Arts and Sciences, Commerce, and Engineering: an intellectually enriching, yet practical educational experience. It is likely that two groups of students will choose to pursue the B.I.S. degree, although the two groups are not mutually exclusive: those who need a bachelor's degree to enhance their employability or their careers, and those who simply seek intellectual growth and challenge.

In Central Virginia, as elsewhere in the Commonwealth, many adults who did not pursue a college education after high school have come to the realization that employment opportunities and economic advancement are hampered by the lack of a college degree. These students swell the enrollments of the local community colleges, enroll in part-time programs offered by Mary Baldwin College, Old Dominion University, Averett College, James Madison University and various out-of-state providers, and increasingly demand that UVA open its doors to part-time working adults.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies, which builds on the educational foundations of students who graduate from the Virginia Community College System, will provide upper level courses for students who choose careers in business and information technology. Employment opportunities for these students are well documented. Students who concentrate in the Humanities or Social Sciences will become better writers, critical thinkers and communicators prepared for jobs in human resources, social services, local government, health services, as well as real estate, banking, insurance, and the news industries. All graduates will be prepared to enter graduate school to earn advanced degrees to further their educational opportunities and careers.

The B.I.S. also will meet the needs of many adults whose educational experiences were interrupted for personal or financial reasons, and who simply want to expand their intellectual horizons. These people may not need a degree for career advancement, but want to finish their bachelor's for personal satisfaction, or the sheer joy of learning. Retired citizens, homemakers, and self-made business people will find that the B.I.S. degree offers an academically challenging and rewarding opportunity for individual growth in a community of learners.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 10.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if

appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

The University of Virginia is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. SACS has been notified that the university is planning to implement this new degree program and has responded that no action on its part is required.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 11.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

As reported to the UVA Board of Visitors on March 27, 1998, "the academic quality of the program will be governed by a faculty committee representing the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Commerce, and Engineering and the Office of the Provost. Piedmont [Virginia] Community College will also have representation on the committee. The committee will approve admissions and graduation requirements, and the credentials of all faculty appointed to teach in the program. It will work closely with the academic schools of the University to ensure that the degree program is academically sound and appropriately rigorous and that it meets the standards of the University and the educational needs of the region's adult students." This committee, named the B.I.S. Advisory Committee, was created in April 1998 by the Provost in consultation with the deans of the several schools listed above and was charged with overseeing development of the B.I.S. program.

Following initiation, the B.I.S. Advisory Committee would be responsible for all academic aspects of the program. It would appoint a Curriculum Committee to review and recommend courses for inclusion in the program. Comprised of faculty representing Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Commerce, and Continuing Education, the Curriculum Committee would review the syllabi of all courses and would recommend additions and deletions of courses to the Advisory Committee.

At least once yearly the Advisory Committee would meet with the deans of Arts and Sciences, Commerce, and Engineering and Applied Science to discuss the B.I.S. program and to report on the participation of the three schools in the program. The Advisory Committee would, at this meeting or at another suitable time, consult with each of the deans about the participation of faculty from that dean's school in the B.I.S. program.

UVA is in full compliance with Description 12.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with

which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

No clinical facilities, industries, or other agencies have been involved in this proposal, and no agreements with such entities are contemplated. Compliance with Description 13 is thus not at issue.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

The University of Virginia will include the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree program as part of the process of Academic Program Review sponsored by the Office of the Vice President and Provost. Program Review is a two-year process conducted by the University's Office of Institutional Assessment and Studies and the Shannon Center for Advanced Studies. Program Review of the B.I.S. will take place on a five-year schedule, with the first review taking place in 2003-04, at which time it is anticipated that the first students will have graduated.

Program Review will include data collection on all aspects of the B.I.S., including data on student learning outcomes, student satisfaction, and alumni activities, job placements, employer satisfaction, and alumni satisfaction. Program Review includes an evaluation by an external visiting committee and results in an overall evaluation by the Vice President and Provost's Program Review Committee and a five-year academic plan for the program, which will include changes that have been found to be desirable.

In addition to the formal Program Review, the program will be evaluated annually by the B.I.S. Advisory Committee to ensure that it is meeting the academic standards of the University of Virginia, as well as to ensure responsiveness to student demand. Based on recommendations of the Curriculum Committee and the Executive Director, changes will be made to the curriculum as necessary to ensure that the program is responsive to the needs of students who are selected to study in this program. In addition, faculty teaching in the B.I.S. program will undergo rigorous evaluation so that instruction of the highest quality is guaranteed for these students.

UVA is in full compliance with Evaluation 1.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed

successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting enrollments, job placement and satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

The University of Virginia anticipates that 75 students will be admitted into the B.I.S. program each year. Students are expected to complete all degree requirements within a six-year period, and it is expected that 90 percent of B.I.S. graduates will achieve this benchmark. The University expects to graduate the first students in spring 2003. In future years, it is expected that sufficient tuition revenue will be generated to support the program's operation.

The B.I.S. Advisory Committee will review the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies program on an on-going basis to ensure that the program remains academically strong and vigorous, that the faculty teaching in the program are of the highest caliber, and that the curriculum, as designed, is meeting the needs of the students. In addition, the B.I.S. Advisory Committee will work closely with the university's Program Review Committee to provide academic planning and programmatic reviews of activities.

After the fifth year of the program, the university will assess whether or not it has met the following basic benchmarks:

1. Is the program academically strong, and does it continue to meet the needs of the students enrolled?
2. Has the target enrollment of 75 new students per year been achieved? Are students making satisfactory academic progress as defined by the B.I.S. program standards?
3. How many students are graduating each year? What is the rate of attrition?
4. Is the program financially viable? Is sufficient revenue being generated to support the operation?

The University of Virginia will assess the overall success of the program using these factors and others to determine whether or not to continue the program. In the unlikely event that the university determines that the B.I.S. program has not been a successful venture, the University will take the necessary steps to close down the program, while continuing to enroll existing students through the program to degree completion.

UVA is in full compliance with Evaluation 2.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

Enrollments for the first class entering in fall 1999 are expected to be 75 (30 FTE students). It is anticipated that these figures would double for fall 2000 to 150 (60 FTE students), increase in fall 2001 to 225 (90 FTE students), and increase to the target level of 300 (120 FTE students) by fall 2002. These students would likely be new to the University of Virginia and would not migrate to this program from existing degree programs. Current statistics at the University of Virginia indicate that, of the 12,296 undergraduate students enrolled at the University in fall 1997, only 197 were over the age of 25. Similarly, only 59 students were enrolled on a part-time basis during fall 1997. Since the target market for the B.I.S. program is working adults at least six years out of high school, and the average age of the local community college student is 30 years, it is unlikely that this program would draw students who would have enrolled at the University as regular, full-time undergraduate students. Instead, the B.I.S. program would meet the increasing demands of the community that the University of Virginia provide an accessible, affordable model for continuing adult education.

Potential market figures are based on data provided by Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC). According to the 1990 census, approximately 16,455 people in the PVCC service region have attended college but have not been awarded a degree. Another 5,013 have earned the associate degree as their highest award. The PVCC service region consists of the City of Charlottesville and the counties of Albemarle, Buckingham, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa and Nelson. (Buckingham and Louisa Counties are shared with other Virginia Community College institutions.)

PVCC awards an average of 210 associate degrees and 30 certificates each year. In addition, during the 1996-97 academic year, 428 students attending PVCC had completed 60 hours or more of college work. This represents a large pool of

prospective students who meet the minimum qualifications to enter the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies program. Adults within the University of Virginia's service area who are graduates of other Virginia community colleges also are potential students for the proposed program.

To date, the University of Virginia has not marketed the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies program. However, there have been a few articles in the local newspaper, The Daily Progress, which resulted from discussions of the degree program by the Faculty Senate and the University's Board of Visitors. As a result of this limited publicity, Continuing Education has built a database of approximately 560 individuals who have indicated their interest in the BIS program. Continuing Education has been in regular communication with these individuals to keep them apprised of the progress of degree approvals. Some of these individuals have the necessary academic credentials to enroll in the B.I.S. program in fall 1999; others are pursuing prerequisite courses and the core requirements at their local community colleges.

Continuing Education administrators have visited several community colleges in the surrounding area. These include Piedmont Virginia Community College, Blue Ridge Community College, Germanna Community College, and others. In the near future, the University plans to conduct information sessions for potential students at each of these community colleges, as well as other information sessions targeted at the local community. Students who meet the admissions requirements will be admitted to the B.I.S. program. The University operates equal opportunity and affirmative action programs for faculty, staff, and students, and declares commitment to a diverse student body.

UVA is in full compliance with Justification 1.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies is intended for adult learners in the Charlottesville area. Because adult learners would enroll in the program for a variety of reasons, it is difficult to estimate employer demand for graduates of the proposed program. For some of these adults, completing a college degree is a means of advancement in their current job, while for others it is a strategy for gaining access to opportunities from which they had been excluded because they lacked a degree. For still others, the motivation for completing a degree is unrelated to job prospects.

In the Charlottesville area, major employers such as GE Fanuc, Comdial, Sperry, Virginia Power, Klockner-Pentaplast, Adelphia, Value-America, SNL Securities, and Chartered Financial Analysts bemoan the lack of employees who have earned bachelor's degrees. Local governments such as Albemarle, Greene, Fluvanna, Charlottesville, Culpeper, Nelson and Rockingham are unable to find qualified teachers, police officers, social workers, librarians, financial analysts, and people who are trained in information technology. There is even a shortage of college-educated workers for countless positions at the area's largest employer, the University of Virginia. However, because there has not been an opportunity for adult students to study part-time at UVA, non-degreed employees of the University, such as secretaries, medical center employees, computer technicians, business operations managers, and human resource workers, have not been able to advance in their jobs unless they earned college degrees elsewhere. The proposed program is intended to remedy that situation and to enhance the University's presence as a good neighbor within the local community that supports it in many ways.

UVA is in full compliance with Justification 2.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree program would be supported entirely by tuition revenue. No educational and general funds would be appropriated to provide on-going support for this program. The University of Virginia has provided, from internal resources, a working capital loan to fund the start-up of the B.I.S. program. The source of the working capital loan is a reserve fund held by the Vice President and Provost for the purpose of providing seed money for the development of new academic programs. The working capital loan will be repaid in future years from program revenues.

For the 1998-99 planning period, \$146,464 in working capital has been provided. This has covered the salary of the Director (\$50,000) and the salary of one classified position (\$24,885); in addition, \$36,555 has been devoted to part-time faculty, including pay for faculty to develop the three liberal studies seminars and other course offerings designed specifically for this degree program and compensation for each member of the Advisory Committee at a rate of \$5,000 per year. Office equipment (computer, fax, etc.) has been budgeted at \$8,250 in the planning year.

UVA is in full compliance with Resources 1.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

The following on-going administrative program resources will be required:

- Executive Director (.50 faculty FTE)
- Program Director (1.00 faculty FTE)
- Administrative Support (2.00 classified FTE)

The Executive Director would be a tenured member of the faculty, whose role would be to act as liaison with the schools of the University and ensure program quality. The Program Director would oversee the day-to-day operation, including overseeing the admissions process, ensuring that advising takes place, making sure classes are scheduled and the needs of students are met. Finally, the administrative support staff would assist in the general operation of the office. Funds have been budgeted for nonpersonal services to accommodate charges for marketing, telephone, travel and supplies.

The resources required for direct instructional costs would fluctuate with the types and number of courses offered, the types of faculty teaching (resident vs. adjunct) and the instructional demands of the student population. It is estimated that, by the target year 2002-2003, a total of 8.75 FTE faculty would be providing part-time instruction in the program. On the planning assumption that each course requires 0.125 FTE, this would mean a total of 70 courses taught. Faculty would be compensated at an average of \$4,000 per course; approximately \$800 per course has been budgeted for nonpersonal services.

UVA is in full compliance with Resources 2.

Resources needed

	Planning period 1998 – 1999	Program initiation year 1999 - 2000	Second year of program 2000 – 2001	Year of target enrollment 2002 – 2003
Full-time Faculty	\$50,000.00	\$85,000.00	\$85,000.00	\$85,000.00
Part-time faculty	\$36,555.00	\$143,612.00	\$165,778.00	\$335,000.00
Graduate assistants	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Classified positions	\$24,885.00	\$45,708.00	\$45,708.00	\$45,708.00
Fringe benefits	\$21,773.00	\$43,772.00	\$45,324.00	\$57,169.00
Total personnel costs	\$133,214.00	\$318,092.00	\$341,810.00	\$522,877.00
Targeted financial aid	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Equipment (including computers)	\$8,250	-0-	-0-	-0-
Library	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Telecommunicati on costs	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Supplies	\$5,000.00	\$41,400.00	\$47,800.00	\$79,800.00
Accreditation		-0-	-0-	-0-
Clinical or affiliations costs		-0-	-0-	-0-
Other resource needs (please specify)		-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$146,464.00	\$359,492.00	\$389,610.00	\$602,677.00
Sources of funds				
Reallocation	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other fund sources (please specify)				
Working Capital	\$146,464.00	\$165,992.00	\$5,610.00	(\$162,323.00)
Tuition & Fees	-0-	\$193,500.00	\$384,000.00	\$765,000.00

Budget request	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

The Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree program would be supported entirely by tuition revenue. No educational and general funds would be appropriated to provide on-going support for this program. No funds have been or would be diverted from existing programs at the University of Virginia to support this program.

UVA is in full compliance with Resources 3.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

No construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space is needed for this program.

UVA is in full compliance with Resources 4.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P3-D
Program proposal**

Subject:

Southwest Virginia Community College's proposal to initiate an Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Respiratory Care program (CIP 51.0908) in fall 1999.

Background:

Southwest Virginia Community College proposes to combine its diploma-level Respiratory Care Entry-Level Practitioner program and its career studies certificate-level Respiratory Care Advanced Practitioner programs into an Associate of Applied Science program that takes advantage of its existing faculty, curriculum, and facilities. The Committee on Accreditation of Respiratory Care accredits both existing programs. The accreditation agency, program graduates, and advisory committee support the college's efforts to combine the existing programs. J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Northern Virginia Community College, Tidewater Community College, and two private institutions offer similar programs. Each of these productive programs produces graduates to meet local needs.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Approval.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

Staff analysis attached.

Fiscal Notes:

Southwest Virginia Community College will reallocate existing resources from its diploma and certificate program to the associate-degree program. In doing so, the college expects to realize a small saving, mostly because it will need to pay one instead of two accreditation fees.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to Southwest Virginia Community College for initiation of an Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Respiratory Care program (CIP 51.0908) in fall 1999.

SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program title: Respiratory Care

Degree to be offered: A.A.S.

CIP code: 51.0908

Projected implementation date: Fall 1999

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

Since 1974, Southwest Virginia Community College has offered entry-level education for respiratory-care technicians. After the college added the advanced-level program for respiratory therapists in 1988, students could complete the equivalent of an associate degree but earned two certificates instead of the degree. The existing programs, as well as the proposed program, are housed in the Division of Natural Science and Mathematics, which also offers Associate of Applied Science programs in radiologic technology and nursing, and certificate programs in sonography, magnetic resonance imaging, and phlebotomy, and a diploma program occupational therapy assistant. Graduates of health programs are in great demand in southwest Virginia. The proposed program fits well with others offered by Southwest Virginia Community College.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 1.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A., A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

Competitive admission marks the existing diploma and the proposed programs, which will continue to accept 22 new students each year. Applicants must have at least a high school diploma with a "C" or better average in high school or college work, have successfully completed an admission test, and have either high school or college courses in algebra, chemistry, and biology. Continuation in and graduation from the program requires students to earn at least a "C" in each course in the program.

The combined certificate programs require 71 credits, which will be reduced to 68 credits with the elimination of one course. The college justified credit requirements beyond 65 by referring to accreditation requirements.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

All courses in the 57-credit entry-level practitioner program and the 14-credit advanced-practitioner program have been offered regularly since 1988; these courses, with the exception of one 3-credit course, will be offered in the new program. All students will take a prescribed 68-credit curriculum that does not have specialty tracks. SWVCC provided all course descriptions and other materials for the proposed program.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 3.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

Upon completion of the program, new graduates will be able to provide diagnostic testing, management, treatment, and prevention of cardiopulmonary disease. They also will be able to demonstrate the ability to comprehend, apply, and evaluate clinical information relevant to their roles as registered respiratory therapy practitioners. New graduates will be eligible to take the Entry-Level Certification Examination and the Written Registry and Clinical Simulation Examinations for Advanced Respiratory Care Practitioners.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

The curriculum for the Associate of Applied Science program differs from the existing certificate programs only by the elimination of one course, Management of Respiratory Care, which the college will eliminate because the content will be integrated into other courses. The college's respiratory-care advisory committee, the accrediting agency, and program graduates recommend combining the certificate programs into an associate-degree program. SWVCC plans to close the entry-level certificate program upon approval of the AAS program. The college will close the advanced-level program when student demand for it ceases, as it is expected to do with the initiation of the degree program.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 5.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

The proposed program is not collaborative with other institutions. However, Southwest Virginia Community College will make its courses available via compressed video and other methods to other colleges within the Virginia Community College System.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 6.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

The college plans to continue using the successful methods that it has used for more than 20 years. For the past several years, these methods included computer technologies, interactive computer and laser-disk technology, and numerous software programs designed for respiratory care. Program faculty are developing some coursework to be presented on the Internet and compressed video. The college has a well-equipped laboratory for this program.

The program is designed primarily for full-time students, although students can attend on a part-time basis by completing all supporting courses before entry into respiratory-care courses. Program faculty work with a small number of students to provide individualized advising and other services to meet their students' needs.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 7.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vita for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

Two full-time faculty and four part-time clinical faculty have taught in the program for several years. The program director has a doctoral degree and many

years of respiratory-care practitioner and faculty experience. He worked with the development of J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College in the development of its Respiratory Care Distance Education Program, which was designed for areas in which no respiratory-care education was available. The other full-time faculty member has taught in the programs since 1991, and the four clinical faculty also have extensive clinical and teaching experience.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 8.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

Program faculty begins working with students during the application process to assist them in ways to be successful in the program. Close working relationships continue with students throughout the program, so that each student is assisted throughout the program. The faculty also works with students to explore and plan for further studies, career options, and job search and interviewing skills.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 9.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

The program is designed explicitly to prepare entry-level respiratory-care practitioners. During the entire program, students have clinical experiences that assist them in gaining employment skills associated with the more theoretical materials presented in the classroom. The program's advisory committee provides feedback about the preparation of students and graduates, and the program faculty makes curricular changes needed to produce graduates who are competent upon graduation.

Since 1990-91, an average of 90% of the entry-level program's graduates passed the national examination, compared to a national average pass rate of 81%. Beginning with the first class of advanced-practitioner students in 1991, the composite pass rate is 90% of the written examination and 85% on the clinical simulation. Employers report that graduates of both programs are well prepared. The programs' success rate on the national examinations places them in the 80th and 81st percentiles nationally on their performance. Eighty-five percent of the graduates remain in southwest Virginia for employment.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 10.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

Both the entry-level and advanced-practitioner programs are accredited by the Joint Review Committee for Respiratory Therapy Education of the Commission of Accreditation of Allied Health Educational Programs. The accrediting commission supports the merger of the two certificate programs into an associate-degree program.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 4.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

Nineteen physicians and respiratory-care practitioners and employers of graduates serve on the program's advisory committee. These individuals represent the health-care community in the college's five surrounding counties that form its service area. The advisory committee supports the merger of the certificate programs into an associate degree program

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 12.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

The program will continue to use the hospitals, clinics, and home-care agencies that have served as the clinical facilities for the certificate programs. These agencies have sufficient patient volume to provide adequate learning experiences for the program's students. The program fully described the agencies in which it currently places students. It will continue to use the same clinical facilities, which will serve the same number of students.

SWVCC is in full compliance with Description 12.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting enrollments, job placement and satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

The program uses a variety of assessment methods to determine whether it is successful. Results of national examinations show that the program's graduates have higher pass rates than do graduates of similar programs nationwide. Other than national examinations, one the program's assessment method is integrated into its capstone course, in which student performance is evaluated. In addition, the faculty surveys graduates and employers about their satisfaction with the program.

The program expects that its student-retention rate will exceed that of those in similar programs, and the existing offering certainly does. SWVCC's retention rate for its entry-level practitioner program exceeds 90%, compared to about 60% for similar programs nationally. The retention rate for the advanced-practitioner program is 100% compared to approximately 60% nationally, although this figure is somewhat misleading, because the vast majority of advanced-practitioner programs are ones that do not build upon entry-level programs, but instead are stand-alone associate-degree programs such as the one proposed by SWVCC.

SWVCC is in full compliance with evaluation 1 and 2.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

The college expects that enrollment in the proposed program will be very

similar to that in the combined entry-level and advanced-practitioner programs. The program plans to accept 22 new students each year, so over the two-year period of the program, it would have 44 headcount students, and approximately 39 FTE students. Essentially all these students would be ones who would have enrolled in the entry-level certificate program. The college surveyed students currently in the entry-level program and found that 100% of them planned to continue into the advanced-practitioner program. The college said that those results show that current students support combining the two programs.

Since the first graduates in 1976, 314 students graduated from the entry-level program. Nine-five students graduated from the advanced-practitioner program. Both programs have grown in size, so that for the past five years, the average graduating class from the entry-level program is 20 graduates; from the advanced-practitioner program, an average of 21 students graduate each year. Since students in the advanced-practitioner program must have completed the entry-level program before entering the advanced-level program, the community gains approximately 20 new employees each year.

SWVCC is in full compliance with justification 1.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

SWVCC provided evidence that its current graduates are employed and that the local community has sufficient employment demand for all graduates. Locally, approximately 25 full-time positions are available for program graduates each year. The college based its estimates on employment rates of current graduates and a survey of local employers. The college's survey of statewide demand for respiratory therapists showed that there are approximately 100 full-time positions for respiratory therapists each year.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

The college currently has two full-time and four part-time faculty for its respiratory-care programs, and these individuals will continue to teach in the combined program. All resources necessary for the program currently are in place. The college estimates that it will save small amounts of money by combining the two certificate programs, mostly through eliminating one of the annual accreditation fees and the associated reporting requirements for it, and by eliminating one course. Southwest Virginia Community College currently has a Title III grant that provides it with funding for computers and other equipment for the next five years.

After that, the college will absorb the costs for these items. The college reports that current classroom and laboratory facilities are well equipped.

The program does not need new space, renovation, or conversion of existing space.

	Initiation year 1999-2000	Second year 2000-2001	Full enrollment 2002-2003
Full-time faculty	94,340	94,340	94,340
Part-time faculty	23,531	23,531	23,531
Fringe benefits	21,024	21,024	21,024
Accreditation	750	750	750
Library	2,000	2,000	2,000
Supplies	1,887	1,887	1,887
Totals	148,532	148,532	148,532

The college has all resources that it needs to initiate and operate the program. The college is in full compliance with Resources 1, 2, 3, and 4.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

**Tab P3-E
Program proposal**

Subject:

The Virginia Community College System's proposal on behalf of 13 community colleges for each of the colleges to initiate an Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Technical Studies program (CIP 15.0603) in fall 1999.

Background:

Virginia's emerging employment markets are varied and numerous and each of them has specific needs for training for existing and potential employees. The Virginia Community College System, on behalf of 13 of its institutions, proposes that each of these 13 colleges be awarded authority to initiate occupational-technical programs designed to respond to community needs. The degree title, Technical Studies, will be an umbrella term that encompasses diverse types of training that meet the needs of local employment markets at each college. The colleges will operate the programs only as long as local needs exist for the graduates they prepare.

The VCCS argues that each of the 13 colleges have a need for and strong local support for a Technical Studies program. Indeed, numerous local employers and advisory committees for local colleges wrote to support the program. In many cases, potential employers wrote in support of the program.

Students in the Associate of Applied Science in Technical Studies will take a core set of courses, then will move into a more specialized set of courses designed to prepare them for the local employment market. Depending upon local needs, each college could offer none, one, or two or more of these specialized areas, which will be called majors.

Further specification of programs will be the responsibility of the Virginia Community College System, which will review proposals from individual colleges and grant them permission to offer specific subjects within the Technical Studies major. The Community College System states that it will use program approval criteria similar to those used by the Council.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Approval.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

Staff analysis attached.¹

Fiscal Notes:

Each of the 13 community colleges will reallocate the funds to initiate and operate the programs. In some cases, local business and industry will contribute some of the resources for the programs.

¹ The format used by the Council staff in drafting the guidelines to program proposals does not fit well with this program. Some items received additional attention, while others are addressed only in a very brief manner. The reason is that the subject matters for this major will differ from campus to campus. Accordingly it is not always germane for staff to determine whether the VCCS complies with the items in the proposal format.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant approval to the following community colleges for initiation of an Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) in Technical Studies program (CIP 15.0603) in fall 1999.

**Blue Ridge Community College
Central Virginia Community College
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
Danville Community College
Mountain Empire Community College
New River Community College
Patrick Henry Community College
Piedmont Virginia Community College
Rappahannock Community College
Southwest Virginia Community College
Virginia Highlands Community College
Virginia Western Community College
Wytheville Community College**

BLUE RIDGE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DABNEY S. LANCASTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
DANVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
MOUNTAIN EMPIRE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
NEW RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PATRICK HENRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
RAPPAHANNOCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
VIRGINIA HIGHLANDS COMMUNITY COLLEGE
VIRGINIA WESTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WYTHEVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Program title: Technical Studies

Degree to be offered: A.A.S.

CIP code: 15.0603

Projected implementation date: Fall 1999

Section 1: Descriptive materials

Description 1: the sponsoring unit's history and mission and how the proposed program fits into them and into other programs offered by that and other units.

The Virginia Community College System (VCCS) leads Virginia's workforce preparation initiatives. Each year, about a third of VCCS students enroll in occupational-technical associate-degree programs designed for employment preparation. In 1997-98, 54% of the degrees awarded by the VCCS were in occupational-technical fields.

The Virginia Community College System believes that the Associate of Applied Science in Technical Studies programs will provide needed flexibility in its degree programs, and will provide the colleges with the opportunity to meet local needs without initiating an entirely new degree-proposal process. The program also would allow the colleges to respond rapidly to short-term and changing needs.

Had this program been available three years ago, Virginia Western Community College likely would have offered a major in railroad operations, an area that had local need when Norfolk-Southern Railroad was changing its operations in the area.

Instead, VWCC went through the program-proposal route to gain authority to initiate the program. But the railroad industry changed its operations and no longer needs the new employees; the college plans to close that degree program.

Within the Virginia Community College System, every college offers at least one occupational-technical associate degree and most offer many more. The proposed program falls generally into the category of industrial and manufacturing

(engineering-technology), which is a category that currently exists in only one of the community colleges, and then in a format not similar to the proposed programs.

Most of the 13 colleges for which VCCS proposes this program are small ones that have limited numbers of programs. The addition of this program can provide the colleges with the flexibility to respond rapidly to local needs without going through an entire degree-program proposal for each one.

Description 2: admission criteria and continuation and exit requirements, including the number and kind of credits required for the degree. Strong educational justification must be provided for requiring more than 60 credits for A.A, A.S., or A.A.&S. degrees; 65 credits for an A.A.S. degree, or 120 credits for a baccalaureate degree. Time to degree should be described for graduate programs.

Admission criteria are determined by program requirements. In general, the community college system is required to accept any person who is age 18 or over, a high-school graduate, or who can profit from the instruction. Students who lack proficiencies in communications or computational skills will be required to correct these deficiencies through developmental courses.

The proposed programs are 65 to 69 credits in length. The Council's staff proposes a limit of 65 credits.

Description 3: majors, concentrations, or specialty tracks within the program. Provide the semester-by-semester curriculum for each track or concentration and course descriptions for all courses in the major and any new or revised support courses. Proposed new courses must be identified as such.

Each program includes 18 credits in general education, 18 - 24 credits in workplace readiness, 15 - 27 credits in content skills, and 6 - 15 credits in work-based learning. The general education courses are in English composition, humanities, social or behavioral science, mathematics or natural science, wellness, and student development. The remainder of the credits will be in the major. In the workplace readiness courses, students will take a group of technical studies courses selected primarily from existing courses within the general classifications of industrial-technology and engineering-technology courses. These courses include concepts in microcomputers, technical writing, an introductory course in industrial or engineering-technology, and some technical electives. The content skills will follow one of the existing certificate or diploma programs in the VCCS system or be developed to meet specific local industry employment or training needs. Each program will have some work-based learning in which credits will be

awarded for successful performance in formally recognized experiential learning activities, such as registered apprenticeships as documented by examination or through cooperative experience or internships. The Virginia Community College system currently administers the apprenticeship related instruction component for Virginia's registered apprentices.

Two examples of potential programs are found at Blue Ridge Community College and Piedmont Virginia Community College. Blue Ridge is working with DuPont, Merck, and Rocco in the development of a biotechnology program that would address specific needs of those industries. Piedmont Virginia Community College is working with Comdial, Inc. in the field of telecommunications. The program in that field would combine basic skills in electronics, information systems technology, marketing, communications, and team building. At several of the colleges, students who already have completed a certificate or diploma program will be able to return to college, earn the general education and technical credits, and graduate with an A.A.S. in Technical Studies.

Description 4: what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation.

The knowledge and skills students attain by graduation will differ with the specialized curriculum that they take. In general, the Virginia Community College System envisions that every graduate will have basic skills in reading, writing, math, science, and speech; workplace readiness skills of teamwork, dealing with change, interpersonal skills; attitude, time management, and conflict resolution; content skills in the technical discipline in which they study; and work-based learning skills gained through internships, apprenticeships, and cooperative learning activities.

Several colleges provided more detail on their assessment programs and how they would work with students in the Technical Studies programs.

Description 5: if this is a proposed restructuring of an existing program, how the curriculum for the new degree title will differ from the one leading to the existing program. Why does this need to be a separate degree program?

This is not a restructuring of an existing degree. The VCCS argues that each of the 13 campuses needs the new program to meet local needs. Although each of the 13 campuses has at least one engineering-technology program, the Technical Studies programs must focus on new areas and thus not duplicate existing programs. In a few cases, some small programs may be folded into the umbrella of the Technical Studies programs.

One reason the VCCS argues for a degree program rather than for the

certificate programs in which some of the subjects could be established is that employers want to have employees who possess more general education knowledge and skills. The employers desire workers who can write and think as well as perform technical skills. The general education and technical skills courses in the curriculum will assist graduates in being able to be the type of employee that today's employers demand.

Description 6: in the case of a collaborative program with another institution of higher education or with business and industry, the extent of the collaboration, including resources available at each institution, resource allocation, program administration, and which institution(s) will award the degree.

The concept of these programs is to meet local employment needs. In most cases, the campus will collaborate extensively with local industry about the needs of employees. The Council staff has encouraged the Virginia Community College System to seek employer assistance to offer the programs. In most cases, this will be done through use of equipment donated by employers or space provided by them. Infrequently it may include financial contributions toward offering the programs, but campuses should be encouraged to use contracts to the extent possible. The staff expects that this will differ from campus to campus and within campuses on a case-by-case basis.

Description 7: how the program will be delivered, including any use of new teaching technologies. Describe what parts of the curriculum can or will be telecommunicated from another source. If the program is designed for part-time students, describe how scheduling, advising, and other services will be adapted for their needs. If it will be offered off-campus, describe its administration, staffing, and support services.

Since emerging markets are highly technical in nature, the programs themselves will be highly technical. They are designed, however, primarily for traditional delivery routes in which classroom instruction and laboratory and cooperative experience is part of the program. Many of the programs will be part-time in nature, but since this is very common for community college students, the colleges already are set to handle a large number of students who attend on a part-time basis.

Description 8: a brief curriculum vita for each faculty member who will be teaching in the program. Identify those reassigned from other programs or degree levels and describe the effect of the reassignments. If faculty have yet to be identified, describe the qualifications of the individuals to be selected.

Since every subject offering will have different faculty needs, this section cannot be addressed for these proposed programs. However, the VCCS will continue to employ full-time and adjunct faculty who meet standards set by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Description 9: provisions for faculty mentoring and advising.

Faculty mentoring and advising will differ with each subject and each campus.

Description 10: how this program will explicitly prepare graduates for employment or further studies.

The overall purpose of this program is to prepare graduates for employment. The VCCS has three goals: 1) to provide a mechanism for quick response to business and industry for short-term education and training; 2) to provide a mechanism to meet employer needs for customized program design; and 3) to provide a framework for students to augment classroom-based learning with on-the-job training and experience. These goals speak well of the VCCS commitment to prepare students for employment.

Description 11: the plan and timetable for programmatic accreditation, if appropriate. Show how the curriculum matches accreditation standards.

Emerging employment markets are very unlikely to have accreditation standards, and specialized accreditation will not be needed. The programs are designed to meet standards of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Description 12: the composition and function of any advisory committee(s) and its (their) involvement, if any, in the development of this proposal and the program's operations.

Advisory board composition differs from campus to campus and major to major within the program. VCCS commits to establish advisory committees for each campus and subject as a condition of approval. In practice, since the subjects will be developed in cooperation with local business and industry, each will have a separate advisory committee that will assist in curriculum design and development and in assessment of the students and the program.

Description 13: a list of clinical facilities, industries, and other agencies with which agreements may be or have been developed, including the number of students each could serve.

Local industries and businesses will work with the colleges to make their facilities available for training, particularly when the colleges are preparing graduates specifically to meet those needs. Local needs would dictate the types of facilities that would be needed.

Section 2: Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1: the plan to assess students' attainment of the program's learning goals, including measures, schedule, and the ways in which the assessment plan for this program fits into the institution's overall assessment program.

Evaluation 2: the benchmarks by which the program will be deemed successful, when they will be applied, and what the institution will do if the program does not meet those benchmarks. These benchmarks should include meeting enrollments, job placement and satisfaction of graduates, and other measures in addition to student learning.

The Community College System offered only general information about how it planned to determine if students met the learning goals in the program. For the most part, the determination will be made through the students' performance in their workplace skills.

Based on specific employment needs, each college must include a plan for assessing student learning outcomes and the criteria for awarding credit for non-traditional learning. In response to a request for more information in this area, several of the 13 community colleges provided additional data about the ways in which they assess current occupational-technical programs and stated that they would use similar methods for assessing student learning outcomes in majors within the A.A.S. in Technical Studies. In accordance with standard practice in higher education, the colleges that award credit for experiential learning will do so only if it is documented and assessed before awarding credit. In cases in which the experiential learning is apprenticeship training, the colleges will use the results of the National Occupational Competency Testing Institute battery of examinations.

Section 3: Justification

Justification 1: student demand and projected enrollment, including a) the

estimated headcount and FTE students, including the sources for the projection; b) the portion of the projected enrollments anticipated to be new to the institution and the portion that represents migration from existing degree programs. Indicate which programs are likely to lose students and the effect of the loss upon them; c) evidence of student demand for this program. Provide a full report of any surveys and a summary of any other sources that document student demand; d) if this program has been part of an existing program, enrollment and degrees-conferred data for as many years as they are available. Application information should be included, if available; e) the recruitment process for this program, including the anticipated gender and racial mix of students and how, specifically, underrepresented groups will be recruited and retained in the program. Describe the ways in which this program will affect the affirmative-action profile of the sponsoring unit.

Justification 2: demand for graduates, including a) the types of jobs or graduate school opportunities for which graduates will be prepared; b) the need for such graduates. Cite sources of information. Labor market information should be appropriate to the scope of the program. Discuss potential changes in the employment market which may affect this program; and c) for programs already in existence as options or majors within existing degree programs, employment and, if applicable, licensing data.

The demand for graduates will be the prime factor in whether the Virginia Community College System will provide permission to the colleges to initiate a subject within this major. For approval each college would have to document student and employer demand adequate to support a program start-up enrollment of no fewer than ten, and maintain an enrollment of at least ten for three years.

Three years after approval and implementation of a subject(s), VCCS staff in conjunction with the college dean, will assess the strengths of enrollments and student progress toward graduation in each Technical Studies subject. Only the subject(s) that fail to show sufficient student and employer demand will be phased out.

The community college system included supporting letters from numerous local industries, businesses, and groups, most of which said that they strongly supported the concept of this program. Central Virginia Community College surveyed its local employers and found that 90% of them supported the concept of a Technical Studies major and that 74% of them probably would hire the graduates. More than 90% of the employers said that individuals who hold an associate degree are more likely to be promoted than are other employees. Business and industries surrounding other community colleges provided similar types of support for the A.A.S. in Technical Studies.

Section 4: Resource needs

Resources 1: describe the costs and sources of funds for planning and initiating the program.

Resources 2: describe the available and needed resources to operate the program:

Resources 3: Describe all sources of funds and the anticipated effect of any reallocation of funds and faculty within the instructional unit.

Resources 4: If applicable, describe any construction of new space, renovation or conversion of existing space, or lease of space needed for this program.

Since each major will be designed to meet local needs, the costs will differ from major to major and campus to campus. The colleges will reallocate internal funds and use contracts with employers to fund the program. In many cases, employers will provide tuition payments or reimbursement to individuals who enroll in the program, which means that VCCS intends to rely upon tuition payments in significant measure to fund the program.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

Tab P4 - Institution Approvals

Subject: **Institution Approvals**

In-state Institutions: Emory and Henry College

Out-of-state Institutions: Keller Graduate School of Management
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Strayer University
West Virginia University

*Decisions of the
Director:* Rhema Bible Institute

Background:

The Council of Higher Education's approval regulations, revised in November 1996, provide for Council action on institutional approval requests on a quarterly basis with Council action in January, April, July, and October. Emory and Henry College, Keller Graduate School of Management, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Strayer University, and West Virginia University request Council action on new approved programs or sites. The stated institutions have met the existing requirements in the Council's approval regulations for their requested approvals.

The Council's approval regulations delegate authority to the director to recognize an institutional change of name, to authorize use of the name "college" or "university," and to recognize certain religious exemptions pursuant to 8 VAC 40-30-50 (C). The director recognized the religious exemption of Rhema Bible Institute.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council approval or authorization to enroll students at Emory and Henry College, Keller Graduate School of Management, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Strayer University, and West Virginia University.

Staff Recommendation:

Approval.

Materials:

A brief summary of each institution seeking approval is enclosed.

Fiscal Notes:

None.

In-State Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant Emory and Henry College full approval to offer degree programs at the master's level.

Out-of-state Institutions:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that Council of Higher Education grant Keller Graduate School of Management approval to offer the Master of Information Systems Management as well as the Graduate Certificate in Information Systems Management.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that Council of Higher Education grant Southern Illinois University at Carbondale approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in Health Care Management at its site in Fort Belvoir for a two-year term expiring on April 30, 1999.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant Strayer University approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in International Business and Bachelor of Science in Computer Networking degrees at its sites in Northern Virginia and Fredericksburg and authorization to enroll students in these programs at its Richmond site.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education grant West Virginia University approval to offer the Master's degree in Physical Education Teacher Education at its site in Loudoun County for a two-year term expiring on April 30, 2001.

Decisions of the Director:

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of the Council of Higher Education ratify the action of the director in recognizing the religious exemption of Rhema Bible Institute.

Emory and Henry College

Request:

Emory and Henry College seeks full approval to offer degree programs at the master's level.

Background:

Emory and Henry is a private, in-state school whose home campus is in Emory. The university is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and was recently granted approval by SACS to offer programs at the master's degree level. Emory and Henry has blanket approval to offer degrees at the baccalaureate level and received authorization from the Council to enroll students in a Master of Arts in Education degree program in 1997. The institution now seeks approval to award degrees in this program, and to begin offering courses leading to Master of International Management program in Fall of 1999.

Emory and Henry College is a traditional teaching institution, with a 163-acre campus containing a library with 315,000 volumes, residence halls, stadium, and health center. The school has approximately 65 full-time teaching faculty and 910 full-time equivalent (FTE) students, a faculty ratio of 14 to 1. There are presently 850 students enrolled at Emory and Henry College, split more or less evenly between men and women. The Master's of Arts in Education program is included in these figures. The proposed Master of International Management program will enroll an additional 25 students and is not expected to cause any significant redistribution of institutional resources.

Emory and Henry College's Master's of Arts in Education program was found to be in compliance with institutional approval standards for enrolling students when it received Council authorization in October 1997, but by Council regulations the program cannot receive unconditional approval to grant degrees until it is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Emory and Henry now has received approval from SACS not only to offer the Master of Arts in Education degree, but any degree program at the master's level.

There have been no student complaints concerning Emory and Henry College, and the institution has complied with all institutional approval and reporting requirements while awaiting full approval.

Recommendation:

That the Council grant Emory and Henry College approval to offer degrees at the master's level.

Keller Graduate School of Management

Request:

Keller Graduate School of Management requests approval to offer the Master of Information Systems Management as well as the Graduate Certificate in Information Systems Management.

Background:

Keller Graduate School of Management is a for-profit, independent institution associated with the DeVry Institute System and based in Chicago. The institution holds full accreditation with the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools to operate at sites throughout the United States. The Tyson's Corner site holds Council approval to offer several graduate courses and degree programs in business at the master's level. Keller has also established sites in Arizona, California, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

The curriculum for the Master of Information Systems Management degree is similar to other Keller Graduate School of Management degree programs and keeps with the school's traditional role as a career-oriented graduate-level management institution. The Master of Information Systems Management degree consists of 15 courses. Four of the courses are foundation courses in Accounting, Organizational Behavior, and Marketing and Management. The curriculum also mixes in three courses from Keller's approved Master in Project Management program. The remaining courses are specialized-content classes focusing on information systems management. The graduate certificate utilizes a subset of classes from the master's degree curriculum.

The Council's approval regulations provide that an out-of-state institution that seeks to offer courses in approved degree areas need only submit an abbreviated application for approval. The Keller Graduate School of Business has submitted such an application, demonstrating that the additional programs will not significantly alter institutional resources, and that the programs are already approved and offered at the institution's home site.

Recommendation:

That the Council of Higher Education grant Keller Graduate School of Business full approval to offer the Master of Information Systems Management as well as the Graduate Certificate in Information Systems Management.

Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Request:

Southern Illinois University Carbondale requests approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in Health Care Management at its site in Fort Belvoir.

Background:

Southern Illinois University Carbondale is an out-of-state public school whose home campus is Carbondale, Illinois. Southern Illinois University Carbondale is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It has offered the Bachelor of Science in Health Care Management degree at Fort Belvoir since August 1997 under a military exemption.

In recent years, the university has seen an increase demand for its Health Care Management program from civilian personnel. For this reason, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale has decided to petition the Council of Higher Education for formal approval to offer the degree. The university will afford priority admission to military personnel, their immediate family members, and Department of Defense employees.

The Health Care Management degree is currently offered at eight military bases in the United States as well as on the Carbondale campus. The curriculum at each off-campus site is identical to the on-campus program. Full-time tenured faculty from the Health Care Management program at Carbondale regularly teach courses at off-campus locations. The remaining courses are taught by a pool of part-time and adjunct faculty who must meet the same criteria as those hired to serve in full-time campus positions.

The Health Care Management program is a 48 semester-hour major delivered in a continuous sixteen-month, three-semester cycle. The classes typically meet from 8 a.m. to 4:50 p.m., Saturday and Sunday for three weekends. Southern Illinois anticipates an enrollment of 50 students for the next semester, including those who are currently enrolled under Southern Illinois University Carbondale's military exemption.

Recommendation:

That the Council of Higher Education grant Southern Illinois University Carbondale approval to offer the Bachelor of Science degree in Health Care Management at its site in Fort Belvoir for a two-year term expiring on April 30, 2001.

Strayer University

Request:

Strayer University seeks approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in International Business and Bachelor of Science in Computer Networking degrees at its sites in Northern Virginia and Fredericksburg and authorization to enroll students in these programs at its Richmond site.

Background:

Strayer University is a for-profit institution whose home campus is the District of Columbia. It is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and approved by the Education Licensure Commission of the District of Columbia to grant the Master of Science, Bachelor of Science, and Associate in Arts degree.

Strayer University has been offering courses in Virginia since 1988, when it opened a campus in Alexandria. The Alexandria campus has become part of Strayer University's Northern Virginia site, which also includes campuses in Arlington, Loudon, Woodbridge, and Manassas. Strayer University has two other Virginia locations: a site in Fredericksburg which began in 1992, and a site in Henrico which received authorization to enroll students in 1998. Strayer University is currently offering diplomas, associate's, baccalaureate, and master's degree level programs in Virginia, primarily in the areas of business and computer information.

Strayer University's sites in Fredericksburg and Northern Virginia had approvals renewed indefinitely in December 1998. Neither location has undergone significant changes since that time. Neither program is expected to cause significant changes in the allocation of institutional resources because Strayer University already offers baccalaureate-level degrees in similar programs within the Computer/Information Sciences and Business areas.

In accordance with the Council's institutional approval standards, both degree programs have been approved by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and by the District of Columbia and are already offered at Strayer University's home campus.

Recommendation:

That the Council of Higher Education grant Strayer University approval to offer the Bachelor of Science in International Business and Bachelor of Science in Computer Networking degrees at its sites in Northern Virginia and Fredericksburg and authorization to enroll students in these programs at its Richmond site.

West Virginia University

Request:

West Virginia University requests approval to offer the Master's Degree in Physical Education Teacher Education at its new site in Loudoun County.

Background:

West Virginia University is an out-of-state public institution whose home campus is in Morgantown, West Virginia. It is fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. West Virginia University does not currently operate any sites in Virginia.

West Virginia University has contracted with the Loudoun County Public School system to provide training to the district's physical education system. The School of Physical Education at West Virginia University will send six faculty members to Loudoun County to provide master's-level training to approximately 25 physical education instructors from Loudoun County and the surrounding areas. The students will attend classes as a cohort, entering and graduating together.

The contract between West Virginia and Loudoun County allows the school district some discretion in selecting which courses will be taught as well as what students will attend. West Virginia University has assured Council staff that the curriculum requirements will be identical to those at West Virginia University's home campus. Loudoun County school district will choose the electives from among a list of electives offered at the West Virginia University's home campus. Similarly, although the Loudoun County school system can decide which of its teachers to send to the program, all students must meet the same admissions standards that are applied at West Virginia University's School of Physical Education in Morgantown.

Recommendation:

That the Council grant West Virginia University approval to offer the Master's Degree in Physical Education Teacher Education at its new site in Loudoun County for a two year term expiring April 30, 2001.

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

Tab P5 - General Education Study

Subject:

The Council's study of general education in Virginia.

Background:

Nearly a year ago, the Council directed its staff to study general education in Virginia. The Planning Committee set this charge for the staff:

To design a methodology for and conduct a study that delineates the state of general education in Virginia. The purpose of this effort is to accurately describe the factual state of general education. The methodology should have a high degree of integrity. The next step will be for the Council, based on the facts, to evaluate the state of general education and make whatever recommendations it feels appropriate.

The staff has completed an extensive review of general education in Virginia's public and private institutions. The report describes the current rationale, structure, assessment, and change processes in general education and presents the course-taking patterns of a cohort of students who entered Virginia's institutions in fall 1993. Since then, some institutions have made major changes in their general education programs. Thus, the course-taking patterns for succeeding cohorts will vary from what is depicted here. In general, however, this is an accurate picture.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Adoption.

Staff Recommendation:

Adoption.

Materials:

A copy of the general education study can be obtained by going to <http://www.schev.edu/wumedia/genedstudy.pdf>

Fiscal Notes:

None.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends that the Council of Higher Education approve the report “General Education in Virginia’s Colleges and Universities.”

**Planning Committee
Executive Summary**

Tab P6 – Decentralization of Program Approval Authority

Subject:

Decentralization of Program Approval Authority

Background:

In November 1998, the Council approved the following statement relating to program decentralization:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Higher Education approves the concept of streamlining the program-approval process so that it focuses on intended outcomes of the proposed program and how the institution plans to judge whether the program is meeting its intended outcomes; and adopting a program-review process that includes a three-to-five year review of new programs, the Council's approval of institutional program-review policies, and periodic staff audits of institutions to see if they are following their policies for program reviews. Be it further resolved that the Council direct the staff to work with institutions to develop new program approval and review policies and procedures and to bring them to the Council no later than its April 1999 meeting.

Action Needed:

Recommend Council Adoption.

Staff Recommendation:

Adoption

Materials:

Draft of a proposed decentralization policy including concomitant assessment requirements.

Fiscal Notes:

None

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Committee recommends Council of Higher Education adoption of the Decentralization of Program Approval Authority Report.

Policy Rationale: *Decentralization of Program Approvals*

Decentralization of program approval authority to the campuses is designed to place the responsibility for the creation and on-going evaluation of academic programs with those best placed to understand the needs, contexts and opportunities on a particular campus – the faculty and administrative leadership of the campus. In regards to the merits of decentralization of program approval Terrance MacTaggart in *Seeking Excellence Through Independence* argues:

Intensifying central authority along with sharply increasing the bureaucracy needed to enforce their judgments, however, is less effective than a relatively more free-market approach to providing the many benefits of public higher education. Management strategies that made sense in times of rapid growth in enrollments, resources, programs, and geographic reach do not answer to the serious challenges facing a mature industry that is adjusting to new fiscal austerity, higher expectations for performance, and the puzzles and opportunities posed by communication technology. Instead there are more effective, less coercive alternatives that suggest that the iron law can be broken to achieve better results.

This policy allows institutions to respond rapidly to changing employment demands. It also allows institutions to establish programs that are subject to market forces of enrollment, employer demand and available, currently existing, campus resources. It is important to note that under this proposed policy institutions must initiate new programs by reallocating existing resources rather than expecting new resources from the state. This funding approach will encourage campuses to make strategic decisions that reflect campus priorities, values and mission.

In creating new programs, institutions may develop programs that compete with those of other public and private institutions for student enrollments; however, institutions are encouraged whenever possible to work cooperatively with other institutions in the development of new programs and to develop innovative ways to share resources among regional institutions. Under the proposed policy, market forces will play a larger role in determining which programs will thrive on particular campuses than they have under the previous centralized program approval policy. However, when institutions decide to initiate new programs they should notify the Council so they can be assigned a six-digit CIP code

Programs initiated by institutions must be consistent with their stated institutional missions. Programs that are not consistent with the institutional mission (e.g. new doctoral programs, health or engineering programs in institutions that do not currently have them) may not be initiated until the Council has approved a mission change for the institution. Proposals for programs that a) are outside the institution's mission and b) are at degree levels above those for which the institution currently is authorized by the

Council and the General Assembly may not be initiated until authorization to develop such programs is received.

In return for providing this increased flexibility the State Council of Higher Education will expect campuses to develop suitable accountability measures to ensure that the needs and interests of the state in providing the highest quality academic programs are being met.

Policy Rationale: *Accountability and Quality Through Assessment*

In return for delegating to the campuses control over deciding which academic programs they will offer, the State Council of Higher Education will require campuses to increase the level of assessment activity focused on outcomes. Each program will be required to develop a statement of specific outcomes, including student learning outcomes, for the program. These outcomes will be rigorously assessed on a systematic and continuing basis through a variety of approaches, including assessment of entry level skills and abilities as well as exit level skills and abilities in relation to these specified outcomes.

More importantly, taking a cue from industry attempts to raise quality standards, the primary focus of the assessment efforts must be on the educational processes tied to producing the desired outcomes. In their article "Defining and Ensuring Quality in Higher Education," Jonathan D. Fife and Steven M. Janosik argue that "....the inspection model as the primary method of judging quality has gone out of favor. Yes, quality inspections are still performed. But there is an understanding that 'you cannot inspect quality in'." They go on to assert, "Therefore, higher education is not served well by defining quality as a static condition. Quality is best viewed as a process and best defined through an assessment of the processes that are functioning to meet the ever-changing expectations of the stakeholders."

While Fife and Janosik go on to argue for use of a specific approach to assessment, the Baldrige assessment process, the important issue which they raise is that unless assessment of student learning outcomes is tied to looking at the educational processes involved in creating those outcomes, campuses are unlikely to learn which teaching approaches are most effective in producing those outcomes with which students. Thus in order to achieve continuous improvement in the teaching/learning process on campus and thus to achieve higher quality educational and service experiences for students, faculty must be asked to engage in using their scholarly skills to develop approaches and interpret assessment results. While administrative personnel in institutional research and/or assessment offices may carry out the mechanics of assessment efforts and do preliminary analysis of the evidence collected, faculty in the programs must be intimately involved in the design and evaluation of the assessment activity, if the assessment effort is to move beyond "quality inspection" to "quality improvement." Since faculty control the teaching and learning process, only they can effectively use the information collected to change that process and thereby improve quality. Thus the

State Council of Higher Education will require that campuses develop a program for Continuous Quality Assessment specifically to include Student Learning Outcomes.

Continuous Quality Assessment

Institutions will strengthen the rigor of the following operations:

1. Maintain on-going, systematic, program-specific assessment procedures based on examination of stated outcomes, including student learning outcomes:
 - Develop clearly stated student learning outcomes for all programs of study;
 - Create on a yearly basis a set of question(s) related to student learning outcomes that will drive the assessment process;
 - Choose an appropriate set of approaches to develop evidence in relation to these questions;
 - Examine students' entry and exit skills, ability, and knowledge levels related to desired student learning outcomes.
2. Submit biennial reports on the assessment questions and assessment approaches being used by programs that will be shared with SCHEV. These reports should:
 - State specific outcomes for each program;
 - Identify the specific questions being pursued by each program;
 - Specify the assessment approaches being used to answer these questions;
 - Specify the character of the client groups being assessed, i.e. cohort group over four years, cross-sectional group, first year students, community beneficiaries, employers, governmental agencies, etc.
3. Integrate assessment results into the decision-making processes of the campus:
 - Incorporate assessment of outcomes as a significant factor into campus program review procedures;
 - Develop reports/documents on assessment findings for each program that can be shared with current students as well as with prospective students and parents;
 - Document specific improvements to the teaching and learning process connected to assessment efforts;
 - Devote at least one departmental/unit meeting a year to the discussion of the implications of the program assessment results from the previous year.
4. Engage in post-assessment audit procedures conducted by SCHEV staff not less frequently than once every five years or more frequently than once every three years:
 - Provide SCHEV staff with access to all the assessment documents from all programs on campus;

- Share evidence of improvements that have been made to the teaching and learning process as a result of assessment efforts;
- Make available the documents that are being shared with current students as well as prospective students and parents;
- Offer feedback on the impact of the assessment process and share directions for future assessment efforts

The SCHEV staff will provide feedback on campus documents related to Continuous Assessment of Outcomes that will be shared with the members of the Council of Higher Education on a regular basis. SCHEV staff will maintain files on the campus assessment documents – particularly the Biennial Reports on the Continuous Assessment of Outcomes.

Through the Decentralization of Program Approval Policy, SCHEV seeks to provide campuses with greater latitude in the creation of new academic programs as well as providing for assessment mechanisms that will provide greater public accountability for the quality of academic programs. Through this program SCHEV also seeks to foster an increased awareness of the value of evidence in campus resource and other decision-making processes. Ralph Wolfe of the Western States Association calls this “creating a culture of evidence.” Through this policy SCHEV seeks the development of evidence that will be credible both within the campus community as well as to external publics about the quality of education being provided to students. Such evidence can be connected to the teaching and learning process that will allow continuous improvement in the quality of the educational experiences of all students enrolled in Virginia institutions.

Planning Committee Executive Summary

Tab 7 – Virginia Plan

Subject:

Draft of the 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education.

Background:

The Code of Virginia (§23-9.6:1) includes the following among the duties that are assigned to the Council:

To prepare plans under which the several state-supported institutions of higher education of Virginia shall constitute a coordinating system. In developing such plans, the Council shall consider the future needs for higher education in Virginia at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the mission, programs, facilities and location of each of the existing institutions of higher education, in addition to such other matters as the Council deems appropriate. The Council shall revise such plans biennially in each odd-numbered year and shall submit within the time prescribed by §2.1-394 the plans as revised to the Governor and the General Assembly together with such recommendations as are necessary for their implementation.

The schedule for producing the plan calls for it to be submitted in the spring of each odd-numbered year.

At its January meeting, the Planning Committee reviewed and approved the timetable and process for developing the 1999 Plan. The Planning Committee met in retreat fashion in February to discuss the format for the Plan and to talk about the issues and themes the Plan should address. The Council staff has led discussions with all the standing advisory groups, as well as with the Strategic Planning Advisory Committee and the Private Colleges Advisory Committee to gather recommendations for what the Plan should cover. The Council staff is now in the process of inviting comments from all those groups on the enclosed draft Plan. Finally, three regional focus group meetings will be held (in Norfolk, Northern Virginia, and Roanoke) to invite comment on the

draft Plan from business and community leaders, K-12 educators, and college students.

Action Needed:

Recommendation of adoption of the Plan with any modifications necessary.

Staff Recommendation:

Adoption.

Materials:

The draft Plan is attached.

Fiscal Notes:

None.

DISCUSSION DRAFT

CHANGING THE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA The 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

What makes Virginia great? You – the people who live here. Your talents, ideas and accomplishments. The work you do. The love, care, and commitment you give to your family, your neighbors, your community. Your hopes, dreams, and vision.

What are your hopes for your future and for that of your families and communities? What will it take to achieve your dreams? Standing at the threshold of the 21st Century, we know that higher education is vital to our success as individuals and as a Commonwealth.

Thanks to the foresight of our leaders and the commitment of our public and private colleges and universities to set excellence as their standard, Virginia is blessed with one of the best systems of higher education in the nation. Offering all our citizens the opportunity for a top-quality college education at an affordable price must remain our number one priority. Virginians demand and deserve no less.

We cannot achieve that priority by resting on past laurels. We must aim to make a high-performing system of education even better, and we must meet the challenges produced by far-reaching changes in social, demographic, and economic conditions, as well as shifting priorities and expectations.

The 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education recommends seven broad goals for changing our system in ways that build on past success, reaffirming the Commonwealth's commitment to make higher learning available to all, and offering a new approach to achieve the aims of access, quality, affordability, and accountability – the cornerstones of our vision for the past quarter-century and for the century ahead.

Those goals are:

1. To improve the opportunities for strategic decision-making at all public colleges and universities by promoting decentralization within a context of continuous quality assessment.
2. To strengthen governance relationships on public campuses.
3. To develop long-term, stable funding provisions.
4. To strengthen the ongoing assessment of Virginia's colleges and universities by focussing on outcomes and value-added analysis.

5. To anticipate the future needs of students, faculties, and communities and to develop planning protocols at each institution and for the system designed to meet those needs.
6. To provide for collaborative programming across institutions.
7. To assess system capacities in terms of capital infrastructure and options for delivering academic programs and to make recommendations for identified needs, including consideration of private campuses.

The 1999 Plan recommends a series of specific actions to advance these goals. The Plan calls for strategic change in how Virginia's system of public and private colleges plans for and carries out its mission rather than for change in the mission itself. Thus, the Plan calls for both continuity and change. The vision set forth in the following section articulates hopes and expectations that have long shaped the Commonwealth's aspirations for our system of higher education.

VISION

A shared vision of post-secondary education that offers to every citizen in the Commonwealth full opportunity to attain a baccalaureate credential informs the system of higher education in Virginia. On the foundation of that vision we recognize credentials at levels beyond and prior to the bachelor's degree. We recognize also that the vision is subject to the measure of each person's ability. We single out the baccalaureate as the explicit goal of higher education because it serves to organize our conception of the results we aim for.

The vision supports not only a diverse set of institutions self-tailored to the needs of specific students and communities but also the full range of educational offerings required to support effectively a comprehensive scope of programs. Those offerings include adequate research-one graduate programs at appropriate institutions, bridging programs to provide for transfer into baccalaureate programs, land and sea grant extensions that penetrate the entire state, extensive opportunities to support research that sustains growth in knowledge and service to communities, and a broad array of public service engagements that expand the bases of student learning at the same time as extending to communities the fruits of scholarship in service of social and economic needs.

Virginia's system of higher education, in short, is a system of results attained through the coordinated efforts of the diverse public and private institutions that provide for effective coverage of identified needs.

No single institution answers to every goal identified by the Commonwealth as the object of the system of higher education. Accordingly, the Council of Higher Education, as the system's coordinating agency, is charged with ascertaining the completeness of the provision to attain those goals across

all of the institutions existing or that may be brought into being. Similarly, the coordinating agency takes the lead in assessing the continuing serviceability of existing institutions toward fulfillment of the purposes identified in public policy.

While the Council is charged with the primary responsibility to assess Virginia's colleges and universities as a system, the governing board of each institution bears the primary responsibility to assess that institution's effectiveness. The best measure of institutional effectiveness is an internal process of systematic review and assessment that is transparent to external observation. We find the expertise that best carries out assessment concentrated on the campuses where programs are sustained, supported by the observations of off-campus experts in similar programs. The procedures for conducting such reviews, however, attain greatest clarity and impact when collected at a level of generality beyond individual campuses. Such external, cross-institution consideration performs an audit function, which can provide assurance of continuous quality assessment and take the measure of an institution's continuing ability to serve the ends of public policy. When an institution serves its own mission well, and its mission is congruent with public policy, it contributes its "widow's mite" to the totality of results aimed at by the system of higher education.

Public policy does not invent higher education. To that extent, public policy seeks to profit from an enterprise that has its own logic and purpose. The vision of the system of higher education in Virginia, therefore, originates in the public commitment to profit from higher education by extending public support to higher education and creating nearly universal access to it. That commitment grows out of the broader commitment to support public education in general, reflecting especially the need for a higher education to sustain a continuing source of instruction for a primary education.

Education supported by publicly appropriated funds aims to advance the common good by means of the good that education offers to individuals. The ultimate limit on the funds to be appropriated, therefore, must be the sum required to reach the goal, and in every era the public advances as far in that direction as its means allow.

The 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education identifies the results aimed at by Commonwealth policy and the changes needed now, and over the next half decade or so, in order to assure that they will be attained. As a plan for the system it is a blueprint to guide decision making by policy makers, State Council staff, and staff at all institutions, public and private. It provides, moreover, for the reasonable expectations that interested citizens and stakeholders on and off campus may form. The Virginia Plan describes the success of Virginia higher education in terms of our best hopes for the system altogether and each of its many parts.

CHANGING NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS

The vision for our system of higher education described in the preceding pages has served Virginians well for the past three decades or more. This enduring vision can inspire and guide us in coming decades as well.

At the same time that the vision remains steadfast, there are rapid changes taking place in the external environment and on Virginia's campuses that mean we must make changes in how our system of higher education advances the vision. This chapter of the Plan describes changing expectations for the system and suggests the overall direction of the changes the system must make to thrive in the coming decade. The final chapter sets seven broad goals for the system and offers specific recommendations for achieving those goals.

The Social Contract

Since Thomas Jefferson first articulated his "dream of an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity," there has been a strong, implicit social contract between the Commonwealth and its citizens. Through a combination of hard work and education, every individual aspires to achieve the American dream of prosperity, well-being, and a fulfilling life. Through milestone legislation such as the Morrill Act of 1862, the G.I. Bill following World War II, and National Defense Student Loans and that program's many successors, the nation, in concert with the states, has sought to guarantee that a modest income need not be a barrier to higher education. Virginia has at times led and at times followed in pursuit of this dream, but it has articulated the dream in a full-throated manner for the past three decades.

What fuels the ambition for nearly universal access to higher education? Virginia citizens fundamentally believe and expect that investing in the education of individual citizens promotes the overall well-being of society. We look to education not only as the chief vehicle to promote the well-being of the current generation but also as a gift and legacy that each generation offers the next.

Why do some fear that this far-sighted social contract, long embraced by the nation and the Commonwealth, may be broken in our time? Why do some think that it already has been broken? The following sections on Access, Quality, Affordability, and Accountability suggest some answers to those questions.

The 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education recommends a series of actions that the Commonwealth should take now to reaffirm this far-sighted social contract and to guarantee that future generations of Virginians can benefit from it. All the goals and recommendations articulated in this Plan are underpinned by our conviction that earlier generations of Virginia's leaders and citizens who signed on to this social contract were right. Investing in the education of

individuals citizens can, does, and must promote the overall well-being of society – else we ought not make the investment.

Are we willing to make that investment? Some observers suggest that society today is less willing to invest public funds in higher education. These observers point to a tendency for leaders and taxpayers to view higher education mainly as a private good – something that delivers economic benefits only to the individuals who attend college – rather than as a fundamental public good – something that delivers important economic and social benefits to the community as a whole. An underlying purpose of the 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education is to engender discussion about and raise awareness of higher education as a public good – by looking at both the cost and the value of that good.

We might best begin a deliberation of education as a public good by considering who benefits from higher education and what those benefits are. Society looks to our colleges and universities to advance the common good in many different ways and to serve many different constituents through their teaching, research, and public service missions. Those served by higher education in Virginia include students and their families, employers in every sector of the economy, alumni, the K-12 education system, business and industry, government, local communities, the state, the nation, and the world. These varied constituents expect Virginia's colleges and universities to contribute to the following outcomes:

- **Educated Citizens:** The leaders who founded Virginia as a Commonwealth – who also contributed so much to the founding of the nation – saw the education of the populace as the most essential vehicle to sustain the revolution they had successfully carried out and to ensure the ongoing protection of the liberty they held so dear. While primary and secondary education also seeks to develop the educated citizen body, one of the most important goals of higher education is to assist young women and men in their development in intellect and character to become “thoughtful, skilled, compassionate and skeptical participants in public and private life.”
- **Skilled Workers:** In today's knowledge-based economy, more and more jobs require at least some post-secondary education. A college education is no longer the key to a golden future, but to a future. Employers in every sector of the economy are raising their expectations regarding what workers need to know and be able to do. Employers seek new recruits with the specific set of competencies and knowledge needed for a given occupation, along with the broad analytical, quantitative, and communication skills best developed through liberal education.

- **Life-Long Learners:** By choice or necessity, a growing proportion of the workforce changes jobs and careers more frequently than earlier generations did. Even those who do not change jobs or careers find that the skills needed to perform their work will change rapidly. The majority of jobs today require employees with “a habit of continuous learning.” An overriding educational goal is to teach students how to be life-long learners. While much of this learning will be pursued outside of classroom settings, many individuals will seek formal, continuing education at intervals throughout their careers.
- **Economic Development:** Higher education is the most powerful indirect economic resource for entrepreneurial economic development. The activities of the Virginia academy in this respect are significant. They range from minor technical assistance to small business development to complex relationships that are pioneering new technologies. Much of the current economic development in the Commonwealth focuses on bringing higher and K-12 education, business and industry, and local and state government together in new and creative ways to compete for business expansion and attraction both on a national and international basis.
- **Research:** Society also expects its institutions of higher learning to contribute to economic development through the research mission. Studies show that colleges and universities perform about 50 percent of the all the basic research done in the United States, as well as about 10 percent of the applied research. But higher education’s indirect contributions to research are even greater since nearly all researchers in all areas have been prepared for their work through formal undergraduate and graduate education.
- **Advances in Knowledge and Culture:** In addition to research contributing directly to the economic prosperity of a region, we have been habituated to expect higher education to add to our collective cultural, artistic, and literary resources and to produce knowledge breakthroughs in vast areas of inquiry.
- **A Strong System of Primary and Second Education:** One of the foremost ways that colleges and universities serve society is through their contributions to primary and secondary education. The most visible contribution in this arena is teacher preparation – both the pre-service training of new teachers and the in-service development offered to veteran teachers. Increasingly, the faculty at colleges and universities are asked and volunteer to work in closer collaboration with their colleagues in K-12 education to help ensure that high school graduates have the academic preparation they need to succeed in college.

- **Flourishing Communities:** Colleges and universities also contribute in many ways to the local communities in which they are situated. Most importantly they frequently participate in turning communities into laboratories of democracy, whether through guided student involvement, faculty and staff programmatic assistance, or the value of institution personnel as citizens in the communities where they live. Moreover, they offer access to cultural and educational resources. College students and faculty provide a steady source of volunteers for community service. And immediate economic benefits to the communities result from the payrolls of colleges and universities located there, especially where the college is one of the major employers.

Balancing Multiple Missions and Demands

To serve these many and varied constituent groups and to produce, as a system, the wide range of outcomes described above, Virginia has developed a broad array of post-secondary institutions. This breadth is reflected not only geographically but also thematically. The distinctive missions of Virginia's public and private colleges serve the important function of enabling users to select among an array of offerings. The public institutions provide opportunities extending from the two-year liberal arts institution through work-force training and non-credit instruction, to four-year comprehensive undergraduate education that is sensitive to various markets, to intensive research environments appealing to users most likely to pursue post-graduate education. Private institutions -- non-profit and proprietary -- similarly provide a wide array of opportunities that can serve the purposes of public policy.

We recognize within this rich array the need for institutions to fulfill defined missions and to resist the "mission creep" that derives from responding to multiple -- sometimes ephemeral -- demands. At the same time, there are strong external and internal forces that pressure institutions to respond to all of these demands. So, there must exist within each institution a sensitive awareness of the need to allocate resources in a balanced way that protects the integrity of mission and the quality of instruction and service that flow from mission. Such awareness is particularly needed where institutions interact with communities and agencies in the role of service provider.

To foster such attention to balanced planning at the institutional level the system must reflect no less attention to balance in the system as a whole, taking all elements of the system into account. The following sections on Access, Quality, Affordability, and Accountability provide an overview of some of the changing needs and expectations that must be addressed within such balanced planning.

Access

Access is central to our vision of higher education for Virginia. To provide the greatest possible access to higher education for all who can benefit from it has long been a defining goal of the public investment in American post-secondary education. It has been the impetus for monumental achievements in higher education, from the establishment of land-grant universities and the G.I. Bill to the development of the community college system and expansion of regional colleges and universities. In Virginia today, the goal of access manifests itself in work force development incentives, distance learning programs, extramural higher education centers, equal opportunity initiatives, articulation and transfer agreements, college preparation programs, continuing education activities, state funding for enrollment growth, and student financial assistance. Together, these activities support the state's long-standing commitment to expand personal opportunity through access to post-secondary education.

But, do recent and anticipated far-reaching changes in social, demographic, and economic conditions, as well as shifting values and expectations, place our commitment to access in jeopardy? Some analysts see a definite danger. The Council for Aid to Education (CAE -- an independent subsidiary of the Rand Corporation) in its 1997 publication, *Breaking the Social Contract: The Fiscal Crisis in Higher Education*, offered this hard-hitting analysis of the risk:

Demand has increased seven-fold since World War II and is expected to continue to grow over the next two decades. At the same time, operating costs have escalated and public-sector financial support has flattened. As a result, many colleges and universities have had to sharply increase tuition and fees and look for ways to control costs in order to avoid financial disaster . . . At a time when the level of education needed for productive employment is increasing, the opportunity to go to college will be denied to millions of Americans unless sweeping changes are made to control costs, halt sharp increases in tuition, and increase other sources of revenue.

Others who have considered the question suggest that, while access to higher education may, in theory, be available to all, the hard reality is that a young person from a family with an annual income of \$75,000 or more has an 86 percent chance of attending college by age 24, while someone whose family earns less than \$10,000 per year has only a 38 percent chance of doing so. Further, too many students graduate from high school without the academic preparation they need to succeed at collegiate study.

Other observers, however, point to the overall rise in the educational attainment of Virginia's citizens as an indication that the Commonwealth is making good on its commitment to access. At a time when nearly universal access to higher education is a fundamental requirement for prosperity in the knowledge-based economy of the 21st Century, about two-thirds of Virginia high-school graduates go on to some form of post-secondary study. The Virginia Community College System, the on-ramp to access for many students, enrolls today over 132,000 students, or about one of every three enrollments in Virginia higher education. Over 50 percent of adult Virginians today have had at least some college -- a dramatic increase compared to the start of the 20th Century, when only three percent of Virginians received any college education.

Whether you see risk or success -- or a combination of each -- in this description, chances are that you see college education as the key to future success for your own children and your children's children, if you are a parent. Chances are that you also see a college education as a key to your own future -- or as the key that has already opened many doors for you.

To keep the doors to higher education open, the Council of Higher Education works in concert with the colleges and universities to anticipate and manage enrollment growth. Enrollment growth occurs under the constraints of available faculty, staff, and facilities. But enrollment grows in a wave pattern, imposing the need for adjustments downwards as well as upwards. Based on projections of the size of Virginia high school graduating classes through 2012, we anticipate that first year classes will grow from 2003 through 2007 and decline afterwards. Virginia must, therefore, accommodate the growth without building excess capacity. As a first step, funding for enrollment growth should be targeted to identified deficiencies -- matching student populations and institutional potential to accommodate growth. As a second step, the Commonwealth should insist that enrollment growth occur in sync with new demand. In the last decade, this approach has been pursued effectively in certain instances. Several recommendations for managing enrollment growth are offered under Goal Five of this Plan ("to anticipate future needs of all constituents of higher education and improve planning protocols at each institution and for the system to meet these needs").

It is not merely the presence of an institution that addresses the important tenet of access. In addition to providing space for citizens, the Commonwealth should encourage the right kinds of space. Courses and academic programs, at all levels, need to be relevant to the needs of the many clients served by the public investment in higher education. The premise underlying Goal Five of this Plan -- and indeed all the goals -- is that Virginia's colleges and universities should become more systematic in their planning efforts to ensure effective coverage of the needs of the clients, without unproductive duplication.

Finally, access to higher education is meaningless if segments of the population habitually are overlooked or if students who do enroll do not progress or fail to meet their educational goals. While much of the responsibility for success rightfully rests with the individual student, we cannot dismiss the responsibility of Virginia's colleges and universities to add the value of opportunity for each student. A fundamental aspect of providing access to higher education for Virginia's citizens is ensuring that our public and private colleges provide the high-quality teaching and the overall academic and student life environment that will help students attain their educational goals.

Quality

How do we define quality? How do we know whether Virginia's public and private colleges are providing the high-quality teaching and the overall academic and student life environment that will help students attain their educational goals?

Determinations of quality in higher education have traditionally been based primarily on the work of the admissions office rather than the graduation office. That is to say that general perceptions of institutional quality are more often influenced by the readily available academic qualifications of admittees rather than by the accomplishments of graduates. Other traditional indicators of quality are the academic qualifications of the faculty, the amount of money spent by the institution on instruction, and the beauty of campus facilities – all commonly referred to as “input” measures.

The 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education pursues a new conception of quality. This Plan suggests that excellence in higher education is best evaluated not by who comes in, but rather by who leaves – as indicated by a variety of “output” measures. This new way of defining and assessing quality in higher education shows up strongly in the strategic plans of many of Virginia's colleges and universities. Further, at every one of the meetings held to discuss the 1999 Plan, participants spoke frequently and compellingly about why this change is necessary and appropriate. It is clear a new vision of what we mean by excellence in higher education is already emerging at public and private campuses throughout Virginia and that faculty and administrators have begun adapting institutional practices based on this new vision. All the goals and recommendations in the 1999 Plan are designed to work in an interconnected way to promote this new vision of quality and to enhance the capability of Virginia's colleges and universities to deliver programs of this caliber.

While each institution must develop specific new conceptions of quality relevant to its unique mission, the following list of examples captures important elements of a shared focus on the “value-added” contributions that institutions make toward desired outcomes and a shift away from focusing on inputs as the way to gauge excellence.

In relation to students an outcome-based approach to quality considers the extent to which the educational programs actively develop students' individual talents. One indicator would be the students' success in applying collegiate learning to activities outside the academic setting. The documentation of such contributions requires systematic assessment of students' abilities, behaviors, values, skills and goals at the beginning and the completion of their educational programs.

In relation to faculty indices of quality are numerous and subject to particular determination at each institution. What is far less variable, however, is the necessity for a highly self-conscious conversation about quality at each campus in order to make quality an effective part of planning and assessment. Whether with respect to teaching, research, or service, quality comes to light only in a highly deliberative environment, in which colleagues sustain through exchange both the motivation for and the modes of conducting assessment.

The indices of quality for administrators may be considered through benchmarking and other more measurable approaches. Administrators attain high levels of quality chiefly when creating campus climates that sponsor the flourishing of students, faculty, and staff, that set high expectations for performance, and that use campus resources to ensure opportunity to meet expectations. The administrator is primarily responsible to assure that all members of the institution understand the mission and goals and their roles in achieving them.

Campuses can achieve high quality performance by requiring systematic attention to ensure that best educational practices are used in the academic programs and that best business practices are used in the management of the human, fiscal, and capital resources of the institution. American industry has shifted its understanding about how to achieve a quality product from an "end of the line" quality inspection approach to one that focuses on the processes that are used to achieve the end product. Likewise, higher education institutions must look at the processes they use to produce desired outcomes in order to discover ways to increase their effectiveness. Continuous quality assessment means examining the quality of processes as well as the outcomes of processes. Most importantly, continuous quality assessment entails placing the full brunt of responsibility for evaluating outcomes squarely on the shoulders of those responsible for delivering the outcomes. Goals One and Two of this Plan recommend changes in policy and governance that aim to place full responsibility upon each public Virginia college and university for achieving results.

Virginia's system of higher education has made good progress in developing and using tools to assess academic programs, in part because the state code mandates that each public institution implement a system of academic program assessment and report to SCHEV on its findings. While good progress has been made overall, some institutions have advanced further than others to

weave assessment into the fabric of teaching and learning on their campuses. This Plan recommends that Virginia's public and private colleges alike deepen, expand, and enrich their use of assessment as a tool to support the broad aim of continuous quality assessment.

At each of the discussions held to develop the 1999 Plan, participants expressed a strong, shared sense of the defining characteristic of excellence in Virginia's system of higher education as a system. For Virginia's system of public and private colleges and universities, quality means offering students extensive educational options that provide them the climate and programs to achieve the highest performance possible.

Affordability

Concern about how to make college affordable for Virginia's students and their families has been a high profile issue in the public debate about higher education in the Commonwealth for much of the past decade. Legislators, policy analysts, and educators approach this issue from several vantages. Some emphasize the long term, progressive, net positive record of public support for higher education, while others focus on interludes of economic and financial challenge in which higher education experiences declines in public funding. The Council has continued to draw legislative and executive attention to the fact that current levels of financial aid funding allow public institutions to meet less than fifty percent of the "unmet need" of eligible students. Nor has the issue of affordability been of concern only for the public institutions. When SCHEV staff met with the Private College Advisory Committee to assist in developing this Plan, these college presidents also stressed their difficulty in keeping tuition affordable.

The Council, General Assembly, and Governor have taken a series of important short-term steps to address the issue of affordability. Since 1994, Virginia's public colleges and universities have undertaken and reported on efforts to contain costs through restructuring. The 1999 Virginia Plan assumes the continuing need for colleges and universities to restructure, to reallocate resources internally, and to review and focus on priorities. This reality remains a permanent feature of the landscape of higher education – here and throughout the nation.

In 1994, Virginia's leaders also acted to limit in-state tuition increases at the public colleges and universities to three percent and in 1996, a tuition freeze was legislated. The 1999 General Assembly passed legislation to adopt Governor Gilmore's goal of a twenty percent across the board in-state tuition reduction at Virginia's colleges and universities.

These short-term measures have been undertaken just as work has begun to develop new approaches to funding public higher education. The old,

formula-based, input-focussed approach to appropriating funds has been unworkable – and largely unused – for the past decade. The study and debate being conducted by the Blue Ribbon Commission on Higher Education, the Joint Legislative Subcommittee on Higher Education Funding, and SCHEV will produce new models, using new approaches.

The in-progress efforts by SCHEV to develop new funding policies will culminate this May and will guide budget recommendations for the 2000-02 biennium wherever possible, recognizing that during a transition period, actual budget proposals may include some elements of old as well as new approaches. Goal Three of this Plan (“To provide long-term, stable funding provisions”) outlines the direction of this in-progress work.

Accountability

Virginia’s statewide system of institutions of higher education is responsible to society in general and as a consequence is accountable to a number of different constituencies: to the Governor and the General Assembly, who appropriate taxpayers’ dollars to assist the individual institutions in carrying out their missions; to students and their families, who are both consumers and the immediate beneficiaries of higher education; to businesses and other employers who benefit from the presence of a well-educated workforce; and to private donors, both individual and corporate, who provide funds that enable the institutions to maintain a margin of excellence that would not be possible through public support and tuition revenues alone. During the discussions that led to the development of this Plan, presidents, provosts, chief financial officers, and faculty at Virginia’s public and private colleges and universities insisted upon their strong sense of accountability to all of these constituencies.

While accountability has long been embraced as a top priority for Virginia’s system of higher education, during the past decade voices from a number of quarters have called for an increased emphasis on this broad aim. Nor is Virginia alone in this experience; state governments, coordinating and governing boards, and concerned citizens throughout the country have urged colleges and universities to take steps to become more accountable to the constituents they serve. Why is this so?

As tuition costs rose and public support declined in the early 1990s, students and families wanted greater assurance that the high cost of a college education would result in the outcomes they sought. Concern about escalating total costs shone a spotlight on faculty and administrative productivity. As American businesses down-sized and right-sized to enhance their competitiveness, increase productivity, and raise shareholders’ return on investment, they looked to higher education to trim its costs, increase productivity, and restructure. Some sectors have voiced concern that college

graduates are obtaining their diplomas without also obtaining the competencies and knowledge that ought to be built into the degree. Finally, a small but highly publicized number of cases of mismanagement within higher education reinforced the sense that a tougher system of accountability was needed.

Beyond increased accountability most observers now recognize that a new approach to accountability is needed. All the goals recommended in this plan are designed to work together to make use of a new approach to strengthen accountability while simultaneously increasing access, enhancing quality, and controlling cost.

Accountability is not the same as regulation; in fact, these two concepts are diametrically opposed. While regulation means control from an external source, accountability implies self-control: being answerable for results or outcomes, while maintaining autonomy and a degree of flexibility. Virginia's system of higher education has traditionally drawn strength from the autonomy of its institutions, but in a *de facto* environment of velvet-gloved regulation. We now seek to reduce the burden of bureaucratic regulations and to enhance the institutions' flexibility in responding to changing circumstances. One of the messages expressed most strongly in meetings with faculty and administrators at the public colleges was the need for a paradigm shift in our thinking about how best to achieve accountability. Now is the time to switch from a system of pre-approval regulations that drain administrative time and constrain strategic planning to a system of post-audit accounting of results.

A deregulatory initiative has already begun through pilot projects started under the direction of the Secretary of Finance in 1994 to test and evaluate decentralizing several aspects of the operations at a handful of institutions – such as finance and accounting, the purchase of goods and services, human resource management, and capital outlay. It is now time to convert these pilot projects into a new way of doing business at all of Virginia's public colleges and universities that have management systems capable of taking on these operations. But we must not stop there. If we want our institutions to act like businesses then we must allow them to act as businesses. Allowing institutions the ability to manage their resources is paramount to their success. Further decentralization and greater flexibility is required -- with this will come greater accountability.

Further, the system may now benefit from extension of the principle of decentralization to programmatic areas, through a shifting of authority to initiate new degree programs from the state agency level back to the individual institutions. Accountability would be ensured through implementation of enhanced program review procedures, including a charge to Council to monitor the institutions' procedures for academic program review and to conduct systematic program audits.

Institutions of higher education have traditionally maintained a system of shared governance, in which the faculty, the administration, and the governing board respectively have defined roles in institutional decision-making. The faculty collectively organize – and to that extent own – the curriculum, but this does not mean a system of exclusive or private ownership. The faculty is rather responsible to students, administrators, and board members; it must generate, sustain, and defend its decisions concerning what is taught. The faculty carries out these responsibilities subject to review by the institution's governing board, which has final authority over all aspects of the institution's operations, subject to continuing oversight by the legislature. The faculty must be responsive to the legitimate expectations of these various bodies for educational outcomes, and assessment of student learning has long been a state-mandated means of holding the faculty and their institutions accountable in Virginia.

Because of its system of autonomous institutions of higher education, Virginia has relied substantially on the boards of visitors in its system of university governance. Higher education serves multiple societal purposes, of which the advancement of knowledge is only one. Governing boards are typically composed of persons from a variety of occupations and professions, and they often provide a perspective on academic matters that is more pragmatic and "real worldly" than that of academics. It is therefore important that members of these boards have an appropriate understanding of the system of shared governance at the institutions on whose boards they serve. The General Assembly has directed the Council of Higher Education to sponsor Board of Visitors training sessions, in order to orient and educate new board members on the nature of their responsibilities. Expansion of these opportunities, and continued development of a related Council of Visitors, is therefore of vital importance to the future of the statewide system.

Finally, accountability to students and their families, the consumers of higher education, is of paramount importance. In this regard, it is essential to note the distinction between academic and nonacademic aspects of students' interaction with the institution. For example, a student stands in the role of consumer when complaining about the long lines at registration or the short hours during which a computer lab is open. However, that same student does not stand in the role of a consumer when complaining about the difficulty of a calculus course or the tough grading practices of a history professor. The statewide system of higher education in Virginia should seek to be responsive to the consumer-oriented needs and interests of students, while at the same time insisting upon challenging each to attain the highest degree of academic excellence of which he or she is capable. In this way, the institution and the student are accountable to each other, as well as to the society that supports both.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

The primary planning assumption guiding this document is that the Commonwealth of Virginia wishes to provide the highest quality education to undergraduates through the diverse range of institutions that exist in the state while at the same time keeping the costs to families and to the Commonwealth at a prudent level. Indeed, the diversity of institutional missions will remain the hallmark of the Virginia system of higher education for the foreseeable future.

Institutional enrollment levels can be expected to grow between now and 2007 and then to level off or decline slightly. Even if the state economy continues to remain robust and growing, competition for state tax dollars to support multiple public purposes (tax relief, primary and secondary education, corrections, infrastructure, etc.) means that we should expect funding for higher education to increase modestly at best over the next several years. Higher education institutions will need to husband their financial resources in a manner that nonetheless will allow them to drive innovation and to go beyond the current high level of institutional performance.

The movement toward decentralization of decision-making authority from Richmond to the campuses will gain momentum. This shift will deliver greater accountability by placing both responsibility and authority with the institutions within a context of continuous quality assessment.

The trend toward viewing universities as part of the economic engine of the state will grow with increasing linkages between campuses and industry that go beyond workforce development issues to increased public and private funding of basic and applied research. Graduate programs in selected areas will become increasingly important as the Commonwealth continues its shift toward knowledge-based industries. The production of knowledge by higher education will become a more highly valued commodity than is currently the case.

With the arrival of the Class of 2004, the K-12 Standards of Learning will bring with them differently prepared students from high school, requiring adjustments by faculty to understand the students who are arriving as first year students, what they know and what they can do. The issue of remedial services will remain an important part of the mission for the Virginia Community College System, for they must provide the doorway into higher education for those who have been away from education for a period sufficiently long to need refresher course work in math, reading and critical analysis.

The Commonwealth's commitment to provide a vital general education background to all college students will remain strong and will be accompanied by a vigorous discussion of what character this coursework should take –

discussions that will occur not only within each institution but also at a wider, societal level.

The mix of public and private institutions in the Virginia system of higher education will remain much the same but will require added regional cooperation in order to maximize the benefits being provided to students. Flexibility and cooperation on the part of higher education institutions will help guide overall planning.

While most students in higher education will continue to learn in environments that closely resemble those now prevalent, an increasing number of students (largely nontraditional students) will learn in environments that have not been part of mainstream higher education in America. These new learning environments will provide a challenge for ensuring quality of programs. Indeed, one of the challenges will be for Virginia educational researchers to lead the nation in identifying the characteristics of students who are best able to make effective use of the exploding number of options for the delivery of educational experiences. The public, thus, will be able to make wise choices regarding the most effective options.

GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

GOAL 1. To improve the opportunities for strategic decision-making at all public colleges and universities by promoting decentralization within a context of continuous quality assessment.

For the past two decades, American business and industry have been learning the importance of strategic planning in order to remain competitive in a rapidly changing global marketplace. Organizations in other sectors of the economy are studying the lessons learned and are strengthening their capacity for strategic decision-making.

Virginia's colleges and universities have likewise improved their processes for strategic change as a result of the restructuring required of them since 1994, because of the new approach to planning and budgeting adopted by the Department of Planning and Budget, and because the campus leaders recognize that strategic thinking is critical for an organization to achieve its mission in this day and age. But, Virginia's public colleges and universities are hampered in their planning efforts by several factors. In too many cases, the authority for decision-making is vested outside the campus. A system of external pre-approval decision-making is too slow and cumbersome for today's fast-paced, competitive environment. More importantly, a system of external decision-making enables institutions to shirk making the tough decisions needed in an environment of rapid change. As business has learned, strategic thinking entails not only deciding to do something new but also deciding to stop doing something

old. Finally, in the current policy and economic environment, the public colleges and universities are constrained in their long-range planning by the absence of stable funding provisions.

The following recommendations will advance the overall goal to improve the opportunities for strategic decision-making at all public colleges and universities by promoting decentralization within a context of continuous quality assessment. This new philosophy of combining increased decentralization with increased accountability also undergirds every other goal in the 1999 Plan.

Recommendations:

1.1 Decentralize the process for approving academic programs within a context that strives to ensure ongoing review, evaluation, and continuous improvement of academic programs. Request a modification to the state code for this purpose.

Currently when campus leaders wish to develop a new academic program, or substantially modify an existing program, they must complete an elaborate process on the campuses. Such processes involve administrative review as well as curriculum committee review at the department, college, and institutional level, including approval from the Board of Visitors. After this process is completed, programs are submitted to the Council of Higher Education staff for review and preparation of recommendations for presentation to the Council. This paperwork intensive process is cumbersome, slow, and contrary to the philosophy expressed in Goal One.

Decisions about academic programs are embedded in the context of a variety of campuses issues and the campus faculty and leaders are in the best position to determine the suitability of such programs for their clientele, the fit with institutional priorities, the responsiveness to student needs, and the availability of resources to create a high quality program. Nor do they operate within a vacuum in their decision-making. Market influences, if allowed to operate, can be counted upon to steer campus leaders away from programs for which there are no takers or too few takers and no further justification.

For the past year, the Council of Higher Education has been working in partnership with the campus academic leaders on a proposal for modifying the program approval process. Under this proposal, the primary authority for the creation, implementation, execution, and elimination of academic programs at the undergraduate and master's level currently resting with the Council would be delegated to the individual campuses. The Council would continue to monitor the quality of the academic programs through approval of campus procedures for continuously assessing stated outcomes for all academic programs. The proposal calls for Council staff to oversee periodic academic audits to ensure that

such assessments are being rigorously conducted and that the results of such assessments are being used to improve the quality of the educational experiences being provided to students. In turn for providing this increased flexibility, the Council would develop suitable accountability measures to ensure that the needs and interests of the Commonwealth in providing high quality academic programs are being met.

The 1999 Plan recommends initiating legislation at the 2000 session of the General Assembly to adopt this new policy for academic program approval.

1.2 Decentralize appropriate administrative activities at every public college and university that can demonstrate it has the management system needed to carry out these activities.

The Council endorses the in-progress efforts, led by the Secretary of Finance, to decentralize many of the personnel, payroll, and procurement operations at those colleges and universities that are part of the pilot decentralization projects initiated in 1994. This Plan advocates moving those initiatives from a pilot status to make them standard practice and to allow other colleges and universities to operate under the decentralized practices, provided they can demonstrate they have the management systems needed to carry out these activities efficiently and effectively. Further, the broad goal of decentralization should be advanced by working in partnership with the colleges and universities to identify other administrative operations that could be streamlined and improved by delegating them to the campus level.

1.3 Work with other state agencies to reduce the burden of bureaucratic regulations and to make the institutions as flexible and autonomous as possible, while implementing corresponding measures to assure accountability.

Working in partnership with the institutions, the Council intends to inventory regulations that the campus administrators find burdensome in order to explore ways to minimize the regulatory burden while still ensuring strong accountability and compliance with the intent of state policy.

GOAL 2: To strengthen governance relationships on public campuses.

A necessary and integral corollary to Goal One is to strengthen governance relationships at the public colleges and universities. The current structure of shared governance is essentially sound but must become even more effective if the decentralized environment of strategic decision-making advocated by the Plan is to be realized. A number of processes are already in place at each institution and statewide to support the governing boards, administration, and

faculty at Virginia's public colleges and universities in carrying out their distinct and complementary roles within the shared governance model. The 1999 Plan recommends continuing and enhancing existing processes and suggests a few additional actions aimed at further improving the governance relationship.

Recommendations:

2.1 Review the mission statements of all public four-year institutions and seek to create and maintain a system of differentiated and distinctive missions among these institutions.

One of the overarching aims of all the goals and recommendations in the 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education is to enhance the system's ability to achieve our shared vision of results by raising awareness that our colleges and universities, while managed independently, do constitute a system. Further, the Plan fosters increased participation of campus leaders in system-wide planning. Within those two contexts, it would be beneficial for the Council and the public colleges and universities to undertake a collaborative review of their mission statements.

2.2 Continue and enhance the Board of Visitors training sessions sponsored by the Council.

For some years the Council has sponsored periodic training opportunities for the members of the Boards of Visitors of the public institutions. In response to a recommendation from the Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Virginia and with strong support from the General Assembly and the Governor's office, the Council staff works to increase both the breadth and depth of these sessions. These efforts should be continued and enhanced.

2.3 Continue to appoint a liaison to each public institution from the Council of Higher Education as one mechanism for strengthening communication and planning.

2.4 Continue and enhance the ongoing dialog between the Council of Higher Education and faculty at Virginia's public and private colleges and universities about the role of faculty in shared governance and ways to strengthen that role.

Taking advantage of an expanded commitment on the part of the Faculty Senate of Virginia to participate in system-wide aims and concerns, Council staff now meets regularly with members of the Faculty Senate in order to keep faculty informed of concerns among legislators and other external constituencies related

to the education programs of the institutions, as well as to learn of faculty issues that might receive legislative attention.

GOAL 3: To develop long-term, stable funding provisions.

In order to engage in the meaningful strategic decision-making urged in Goal One of this Plan, Virginia's public colleges and universities need added control of their human, fiscal, and capital resources. Further, to engage in long-term strategic planning, they must have an improved ability to anticipate future funding provisions and to understand the probable impact of their planning on funding provisions – while keeping in mind that economic conditions are invariably subject to some unpredictability. Planning and budgeting need to be more closely coordinated. Also, the overall provisions for allocating taxpayer support to the public institutions and, through the Tuition Assistance Grant program to the private institutions, should be more securely connected to the public policy purposes that originate the support.

The following recommendations aim to address each of these concerns.

Recommendations:

3.1 Recommend to the Executive and Legislative branches of government new approach to determining state appropriations to institutions of higher education.

In developing the 2000-02 budget recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly, the Council intends to make such recommendations using a new approach to determine institutional appropriations. The new approach is designed to maximize autonomy for decision making at the institution level while holding the institution accountable for the use of such funds. A fundamental aspect of this model will also be to recognize mission differentiation and account for it accordingly.

3.2 Establish base funding guidelines based on the necessary and continuing functions of the institutions.

In developing a new funding model, the Council will aim to ensure that base funding for each institution is adequately set and that provisions are made for ongoing adjustment of that base to be certain that ongoing operations of the institutions are appropriately funded. The new funding model will be predicated upon the expectation that, in return for this reliable funding stream, institutions must meet minimum expectations of the Commonwealth. These minimum expectations will recognize the differing missions of each institution.

3.3 Provide an element of funding based on performance indicators.

In its new approach to funding higher education, the Commonwealth should include an element of performance based funding. The Council, through its new funding model, intends to incorporate an element of funding that is dependent upon outcomes. Under this model, the Commonwealth would prescribe the desired outcomes and provide funding to those institutions that achieve them.

3.4 Define accountability measures to assure opportunity for review of base funding measures.

Premised in this new funding approach is the philosophy that institutions should be given the ability to manage their fiscal, human, and capital resources. In order to accomplish this, the institutions need freedom from certain state bureaucratic processes and regulations. In exchange for these freedoms, institutions must meet certain standards to measure management accountability. The Council will develop such measures and assure their review as part of base budget analysis.

3.5 Secure for institutions sufficient control over assets to assure maximum return on investments and control of resources.

Again, as a means for institutions to fully recognize their strategic decision making opportunities, decision making must reside with the institution. Freedom to do so must be provided. Allowing institutions sufficient control of their assets will allow them to reap the benefits of greater return on investments. In addition, such control will allow institutions greater ability to adapt in a timely way to changing environments hence reducing the opportunity costs associated with slow, externally controlled decision-making processes.

GOAL 4: To strengthen the ongoing assessment of the programs and units at Virginia's colleges and universities by focussing on outcomes and value-added analysis.

Virginia's colleges and universities were early adopters of new models for assessing academic programs during the 1980s. Assessment practices are strong and widespread. Nevertheless, the new outcome-focussed vision of quality, which is emerging at Virginia's public and private colleges and universities, can only be achieved through the new, expanded approach to assessment described in the following recommendations.

Recommendations:

4.1 Revise the assessment guidelines to require systematic approaches to collecting evidence of the impact of institutional programs on students and others in light of mission and goals statements.

The campuses must develop mechanisms for gathering information to support continuous improvement of all aspects of campus performance, with particular emphasis on those activities that most directly support student learning. Campuses will need to develop what Ralph Wolfe, Executive Director of the Western States Accrediting Association, has called “a culture of evidence.” A culture of evidence relies upon thoughtfully designed and carefully executed assessment programs and the commitment of faculty and administrators to use the collected information systematically to support campus decision-making. The active engagement of the faculty is essential to bring a scholarly approach to assessment and to ensure that the evidence collected will be valued and used.

4.2 Develop new mechanisms to assist students and families in choosing a college based on their specific educational goals and the relative ability of different institutions to provide the educational setting best suited to those goals.

Research on how students choose which college to attend shows that there are a wide range of factors influencing that decision. It is not clear that the primary decision factor for many students when choosing a college is to select the educational setting best suited to their individual academic goals. Many other factors such as expected social activities, family ties, location, cost, and the decisions of friends strongly influence the decision-making. The Council intends to work collaboratively with the institutions to explore new mechanisms for providing information to prospective students that helps them to understand the performance of a college from an outcome-focussed conception of quality. This initiative will build on the earlier work published in the Council’s *Indicators of Institutional Mission* series.

4.3 Develop new mission- and case-sensitive alternatives to the evaluation of graduation and retention rates and other indicators of student outcomes.

Two typical measures used to gauge student learning outcomes and institutional performance are retention rates and graduation rates. These measures, as most commonly used, do not adequately distinguish among differences in institutional mission nor do they make adequate provision for the fact that many students today pursue post-secondary education to develop specific skills and knowledge without necessarily planning to obtain a

baccalaureate degree. Finally, the current system for evaluating overall student performance does not adequately track students as they move from one institution to another. The Council is actively researching an approach that would better address these issues.

4.4 Develop a new mechanism for institutions to report to the Council, the Secretary of Education, the Department of Planning and Budget, and the General Assembly on their progress toward their strategic plans, which will include an emphasis on assessment of outcomes in all aspects of their strategic plans.

The Appropriation Act requires institutions to report on their restructuring and strategic planning efforts. Thus far, this reporting has been a paper intensive exercise yielding little value to the recipients or the institutions. In order to provide a more useful tool, a new mechanism will be developed which will measure progress toward the goals outlined in their strategic plans as well as in this Plan.

4.5 Ensure that the Council's policies for approving institutions to deliver academic programs within Virginia are consistent with highest quality higher education.

The Council intends to undertake a full review of its policies, procedures, and regulations for institutional approval to ensure that the highest quality educational programs are delivered.

GOAL 5: To anticipate the future needs of all constituents of higher education and improve at each institution and for the system planning protocols designed to meet those needs.

While Goal One recommends an important change needed to improve strategic decision-making at the individual campuses, Goal Five aims to improve the strategic decision-making of the system as whole. A critical component of system-wide planning is the identification of all the needs of the constituents of higher education and a review of whether the system, through its collective efforts, is meeting those needs adequately. The following recommendations are intended to accomplish two purposes: 1) to improve the system-wide planning process and 2) to offer specific recommendations that will improve the ability of Virginia's colleges and universities to provide access to their services for the various constituents.

Recommendations:

5.1 Enhance system-wide planning processes by increasing the participation of Virginia's public and private colleges

in developing the Virginia Plan for Higher Education and by establishing stronger linkages between the planning for and funding of individual campuses and the Virginia Plan.

In developing the 1999 Virginia Plan for Higher Education, the Council has invited active participation from the public and private institutions. Likewise, in-progress efforts to develop new funding models, to review the general education programs, and to decentralize the academic program approval process have invited strong participation by campus leaders. This participatory approach should become standard practice.

Further, institutional planning efforts and reporting, such as the consolidated reporting required in the state Appropriation Act, should be tied to goals and strategies outlined in this Plan and subsequent updates to it. Target funding initiatives – performance funding – should follow and undergird institutional and statewide plans.

5.2 Recommend that the Commonwealth meet its long sought goal of funding at least 50 percent of unmet undergraduate financial aid need.

The Commonwealth has had a long-standing goal of providing state funds to meet at least 50 percent of unmet financial need. The Commonwealth has never achieved this goal. Even though actions such as the tuition reduction and tuition limits have helped to keep a college education affordable, they have not provided those in most need with the necessary aid. The Council will continue to reinforce its desire for the Commonwealth to commit resources to meet its long sought financial aid goal.

In addition, the Council should seek funds from all sources to leverage its state funds. In particular, the Council will work with agencies such as the Department of Education to seek grant funds for scholarship and early intervention from the Federal Gear Up program.

5.3 Engage the institutions in a review of the coverage of higher education institutions across the Commonwealth.

The Council welcomes the study approved by the 1999 General Assembly to evaluate the need for a college in south-central Virginia. The Council will extend the lessons learned from this study to a review of the coverage of higher education institutions across the Commonwealth.

5.4 In cooperation with the appropriate public and private institutions, undertake a review of the robustness of

cooperative higher education centers and develop best practices that can be employed by all.

Consistent with their cooperative origins, the higher education centers should take advantage of course and program offerings from the Southern Regional Electronic Campus and similar high-quality "virtual" university initiatives.

5.5 Ensure that enrollment planning and policies are predicated upon effective use of the existing building capacity at both the public and the private colleges and universities.

While undergraduate growth is expected to occur at public institutions across the Commonwealth, targeted growth should occur at institutions that have existing capacity for it. Further, in cooperation with the private, non-profit colleges, the Council should evaluate the capacity within these institutions to accommodate anticipated enrollment growth. Evidence of capacity should be a part of the Council's enrollment projection process.

5.6 Request the General Assembly to revive a pilot program that serves community college graduates attending selected private institutions, the better to meet needs of under served populations and to increase enrollment in underutilized institutions.

This program operated on trial basis in 1996-97 at three private, non-profit institutions. The program is designed, in large measure, to take advantage of capacity at Virginia's private colleges to handle expected enrollment growth, without the Commonwealth needing to build excess capacity at the public institutions to handle a relatively short interval of high enrollment.

5.7 Seek innovative ways – other than adding campuses – to extend higher education into communities and populations that are not fully served by existing offerings and ensure that funding provisions support this end.

5.8 Minimize institutional barriers that delay a student's progress toward a degree

In cooperation with the colleges and universities, the Council should develop guidelines, or best practices, on advising programs, undergraduate degree requirements, course availability, counseling, and other factors that contribute to the timely completion of a degree program. The General Assembly, through its funding policies, should ensure that the public investment in higher education is not solely for those deemed most likely to succeed.

In addition, the Council should review with the institutions the provisions they have made to ensure that academic programs and other campus activities are made fully available to students with disabilities.

GOAL 6: To provide for collaborative programming across institutions.

Across the country, colleges and universities increasingly collaborate to deliver academic programs and support administrative activities. Research has also become increasingly collaborative, enabled in part by advances in computing and telecommunications. In fact, the presence of a widespread, reliable, and high capacity technology infrastructure is a powerful driver of collaboration across time and space.

During the past decade, the Virginia system of higher education has initiated numerous collaborative programs, including VIVA (the Virtual Library of Virginia), the Microelectronics Consortium, the Graduate Physics Consortium, and the Virginia Graduate Marine Science Consortium – to name only a few examples. These programs successfully increase access, enhance quality, and lower costs. Most recently, a number of Virginia's colleges and universities have created an Electronic Campus of Virginia through voluntary efforts to coordinate distance education offerings available within the Commonwealth and to make it easier for students from many different institutions to take advantage of a growing volume of electronically delivered courses and programs.

Collaboration works most successfully when it arises from shared interests and concerns and is perceived by all participants as advancing their strategic plans. Efforts to "mandate" cooperation where there is not a strategic and mutually beneficial area of need have historically met with abysmal failure. At the same time, it should be noted that many aspects of current public policy in Virginia and elsewhere act as disincentives to cross-institutional collaboration. This is particularly true with regard with regard to partnerships that involve both public and private institutions.

The following recommendations are designed to provide incentives and support for voluntary collaboration among Virginia's public and private institutions and to remove inappropriate barriers to such collaboration. These recommendations also suggest areas in which fruitful collaboration might be pursued between higher education and Virginia's businesses and industry, as well as between higher and secondary education in Virginia. To a significant extent, increased collaboration will be a logical outgrowth of the greater emphasis on system-wide planning, which is the focus of Goal Five.

Recommendations:

6.1 Recommend changes in existing state policy to facilitate cross-institution collaboration on academic programs.

Council staff will work collaboratively with the steering committee of the Electronic Campus of Virginia to develop a set of recommendations for changes in existing state policy that would simplify the administrative aspects of cross-institution collaboration in the delivery of academic programs (including but not limited to the distance education programs). Further, they will identify existing policies that make it financially disadvantageous for institutions (both public and private) to participate in such collaborative programs. Once these areas of needed change are identified, the Council will put forward recommendations for the needed legislative or executive changes.

6.2 Target the development of new consortia for the delivery of graduate education and for research partnerships among institutions and between institutions and business and industry in order to build on existing research and institutional strengths, support state goals for economic development, and match state priorities for addressing societal issues.

6.1 Develop recommendations on necessary changes in the intellectual property policies and relevant legislation in order to promote collaborative development and delivery of courseware and technology transfer.

6.2 In consultation with DOE and the institutions, develop a proposal to establish a pool of funds that would be awarded competitively to regions in Virginia to support collaborative efforts among public and private colleges and universities and local school districts to improve the readiness of high school graduates for college level study.

GOAL 7: To assess system capacities in terms of capital infrastructure and options for delivering academic programs and make recommendations for identified needs, including consideration of private campuses.

Many of the buildings on college campuses across Virginia are venerable monuments to learning, worthy of study themselves. The Wren building on the campus of the College of William and Mary was built in 1694 and is the oldest academic structure in America in continuous use. Cushing Hall, built in 1824 on the Hampden Sydney campus, once housed the entire college operation; it is

now a dormitory. The Rotunda, the centerpiece of Thomas Jefferson's "academical village," was built in 1826. Today, there are 61 buildings on the University of Virginia campus that are more than 100 years old.

Buildings are a highly visible and valuable part of higher education. Their design, construction quality, and accessibility create the physical environment for learning. They require sufficient annual investment in their maintenance, renewal, and adaptation. The replacement value for the nearly 3,000 buildings owned by Virginia's public colleges and universities is estimated to be \$4 billion. The Commonwealth must balance the needs for preservation and conservation of its many architectural treasures with the pressures for space allocation and growth. The Council of Higher Education has statutory responsibility to consider the future needs of higher education in Virginia, including the facilities of each institution. This responsibility includes developing policies, formulae, and guidelines for the fair and equitable distribution of public funds among state-supported institutions, taking into account enrollment projections and institutional missions.

The distinctions among classroom and laboratory buildings, libraries, student centers, residence halls, and faculty offices have become much less clear than they once were. Technology has reduced the old constraints of time and place. For centuries, students earned academic credit for hours spent in direct contact with an instructor. The provision for electronic instruction, or distance learning, allows for extensive contact without requiring student and teacher to be in the same place. The emergent technology allows for multiple modes of learning and the possibility of greater interaction and sharing of knowledge. However, these new technologies add both opportunity and complexity to fixed asset decision making. Buildings, infrastructure, and equipment demand large capital investments and significant annual operating expenditures.

The Commonwealth's system of higher education is an asset worth preserving. Virginians, throughout our history, have realized the importance of higher learning and the significant investment that must follow. Buildings, infrastructure, and equipment are long-term commitments that will place significant demands on state resources, in good times and lean, well into the future. Higher education needs an on-going, predictable source of funding to meet these demands. To help in this regard, we offer the following recommendations.

Recommendations:

7.1 Seek to improve the capital planning process.

It can often take two years to complete the current capital outlay planning process. Institutional decentralization or deregulation from state procedures will help shorten this lengthy process. The Council supports the principle of the six-year capital outlay planning process; however, there must be a more direct link between planning and new construction. Provisions for capital outlay should be taken into account in new funding mechanisms.

7.2 Explore the possibility of establishing a financing vehicle (revenue bonds) similar to the Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund to address the documented backlog of major renovation projects.

7.3 Provide maintenance reserve funding as part of an institution's base funding.

7.4 Since 1982, the state has provided \$219 million in maintenance reserve appropriations to colleges and universities for projects that cost between \$25,000 and \$500,000. The state should build this continuing expectation into base budget calculations.

7.5 Develop a provision in the funding model to reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance at our colleges and universities.

When operating funds are insufficient and capital funds are not available for use, maintenance of facilities is deferred. We support the Council of State Senior Business Officers (CSSBO) in their study of deferred maintenance and recognize the need for funding strategies to reduce the maintenance backlog to a manageable level and eliminate the accumulation of additional deferred maintenance. A new funding formula should explicitly address this need.

7.6 Encourage, via capital outlay recommendations, institutions to utilize technology to provide access rather than relying solely on bricks and mortar.

7.7 Maintain the Commonwealth's commitment to the Higher Education Equipment Trust Fund.

The Governor and General Assembly created the Equipment Trust Fund with great foresight and imagination in 1986. Since its inception, the debt-financed program has provided nearly \$400 million for the replacement of obsolete equipment and the acquisition of new technology. We recommend that Virginia maintain its commitment to the Trust Fund.

STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**OUTREACH COMMITTEE MEETING
AGENDA**

MARCH 25, 1999

11:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

**James Monroe Building
9th Floor Small Conference Room**

ACTION ITEMS

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Approval of Agenda | |
| 2. | Approval of Minutes from February 16, 1999 | O1 |

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|----|
| 3. | Liaison Report | |
| 4. | Statistical Abstract Update | O2 |
| 5. | Board of Visitors Training | O3 |

**STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION
OUTREACH COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES NO. 22
FEBRUARY 16, 1999**

The February meeting of the Outreach Committee was called to order by Karen F. Marcus, chair, at 10:10 a.m. at Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia. Members present: Douglas Combs, Scott Goodman, H. Lynn Hopewell, and John D. Padgett. Other Council present: Walter M. Curt. Staff present: William B. Allen, Frances C. Bradford, G. Paul Nardo and Pamela H. Landrum.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On motion by Mr. Combs, seconded by Mr. Goodman, the agenda for the February meeting was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Mr. Combs, seconded by Mr. Goodman, the minutes of the January 19, 1999 meeting were approved as submitted.

OUTSTANDING FACULTY AWARDS

Mr. Nardo briefed the Committee on the arrangements for the presentation of the 1999 Outstanding Faculty Awards. He indicated that he has been working closely with the Governor's Policy, Press Offices and the Executive Mansion on the details of the activities. He stated that the press conference is scheduled for 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 17 in the Old Senate Chamber of the Capitol. Mr. Padgett, in his capacity as chairman of the Council, will make brief introductory remarks and introduce the Governor. Following the Governor's speech, Dr. Allen will introduce the award recipients as the Governor and First Lady present the awards.

Mr. Nardo announced that immediately following the press conference, Dr. Allen and Council members would escort the recipients to the Senate and House Chambers where the recipients will be introduced on the floor. He also noted that a reception will be hosted by the First Lady, Roxanne Gilmore.

On motion by Mr. Combs, seconded by Mr. Padgett, the Committee accepted the following resolution to be submitted to the full Council for approval:

WHEREAS, Virginia's system of higher education consists of 39 state-supported and more than 70 private not-for-profit and for-profit private colleges and universities; and

WHEREAS, that system is actively educating more than 300,000 students of all ages, from all parts of the Commonwealth and the country, at any one time; and

WHEREAS, Virginia's system-of higher education contributes to the economic prosperity and social progress of the Commonwealth by providing trained workers, community service, and valuable research; and

WHEREAS, the success of the system and those who benefit from it are attributable to the dedicated and hard-working faculty at all Virginia institutions; and

WHEREAS, the quality of the faculty at Virginia's institutions of higher education is unparalleled; and

WHEREAS, Virginia faculty have contributed in countless ways to the intellectual and personal development of their students and thereby to the quality of the civic, cultural, and intellectual vitality of the Commonwealth

WHEREAS, the Outstanding Faculty Awards Program appropriately recognizes the finest among Virginia's faculty for their teaching, research, and community service efforts; and

WHEREAS, Virginia faculty have played a central role in both the development and dissemination of knowledge; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of Higher Education is pleased to recognize those selected as 1999 Outstanding Faculty Award recipients and who will officially be announced by the Governor and First Lady on February 17, 1999; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Council of Higher Education graciously thanks the recipients for dedication to teaching, research and public service and wish them well in their very important work of serving as faculty members at Virginia's colleges and universities.

LIAISON REPORT

Mr. Nardo reported that the in addition to preparing for the Outstanding Faculty Awards, staff continues the busy schedule of attending legislative meetings, preparing LAS's (legislative action summary) and FIS's (fiscal impact statements). Mr. Nardo reported Dr. Allen, Ms Palmiero and Dr. Schilling have done a good job in articulating the Council's positions and in interacting with members of the legislature.

Mr. Nardo reminded the Committee about the information available on SCHEV's website. He reported that Dr. Allen's recent presentation to the Blue Ribbon Commission is now available on the website.

BOARD OF VISITORS TRAINING

Ms Marcus announced that the date for the board of visitors training has been set for April 30 at the Richmond Omni. Mr. Nardo indicated the focal point for the morning session would be the Virginia Plan. He stated that to help set the context of the discussions, a speaker would give a broader prospective of strategic planning for system. The afternoon session would focus on funding issues leading up to the budget submission process.

Mr. Nardo indicated that a draft agenda would be sent to Council for their review and comments. Invitations are scheduled for mailing by March 5.

Committee members suggested that representatives from the Governor's administration be invited to participate. It was also suggested that a meeting of the Council of Presidents be held in conjunction with the BOV training.

STATISTICAL INDEX

Ms Marcus indicated that at the last meeting, Mr. Curt offered to put together a draft statistical index. Mr. Curt said that he had brought a version with him. Ms Marcus asked that copies be provided to all Council members for their review and suggestions and that the Committee discuss the format and contents at the next meeting.

Ms Marcus thanked Mr. Curt for his work in providing the draft statistical index.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Pamela H. Landrum

Outreach Committee Executive Summary

Tab O2 - Virginia's Higher Education Statistical Index

Subject Virginia's Higher Education Statistical Index

Background

At the December Council meeting, members indicated interest in the creation of a publication that summarizes statistics about higher education in Virginia. At the January meeting, staff provided Council members with examples from the Council's web-site of the Statistical Summaries and excerpts from similar publications from other states. At its February meeting a Council member presented a draft version of what such a publication might look, based, in part, on the current Council electronic publication the "Statistical Index" and related data.

The draft document contained a summary of information and data about Virginia's state-supported colleges and universities. It included both historical and current information from a *system-wide perspective* about institutional growth and enrollment (headcount and FTE), tuition and fees, SAT scores of incoming freshmen, and finances. In addition, the document offered *institution specific information* in such areas as size and make-up of the student body, admissions, and degrees offered.

To focus discussion on the contents of the ultimate Virginia Higher Education Statistical Index, staff endeavored to identify the "fields" or "issue areas" provided in the Council member's draft "Statistical Abstract" and nine other similar or related documents produced in Virginia and across the nation. The attached chart enables easy comparison of the "fields" or "issue areas." Moreover, more detailed lists outlining the information presented in the nine documents are attached.

Currently, there exist several publications that provide general statistical overviews of higher education institutions. Among other things, these publications serve to inform students and parents making college choices. National publications rank institutions and their specific programs in a variety of ways, including overall value and academic quality. In addition, individual institutions produce numerous documents touting their programs, amenities, and unique qualities. However, there is no comprehensive document that specifically compares Virginia institutions.

The challenge for the Council is to decide whether to modify existing publications or to create new ones which do not duplicate currently available publications but 1) offer insights into the performance of Virginia higher education, and 2) provides additional valuable information for public review.

Action Needed

Recommend Council adoption of desired publication content.

Staff Recommendations

Publication of summary data in traditional fields with modest statistical testing.

Materials

- I. Chart of Fields/Issues Areas in Various Documents
- II. Fields/Issue Areas in Various Documents including:
 - Draft Statistical Abstract
 - SCHEV'S Statistical Summary
 - Five SCHEV Indicators
 - Facts and Figures (tri-fold brochure)
 - James Madison University's - Financing of Higher Education in Virginia: Analysis and Issues
 - Washington State Higher Education Statistics
 - Maryland 1999 Data Book
 - UNC System Institutional Profiles 1998-99
 - Fiske Guide to Colleges 1999
 - US News and World Report
- III. Possible Outline for Future Publication
- IV. Possible of Publication Production

Fiscal Notes

The costs associated with the creation, production, and dissemination of the final version of this document are difficult to estimate at this time.

I. Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas

Issue Areas*/Publication	Draft Statistical Abstract	SCHEV'S Statistical Summary	Five SCHEV Indicators	Facts and Figures (tri-fold brochure)	JMU Analysis and Issues	Wash. State Higher Ed Statistics	Maryland 1999 Data Book	UNC System Inst. Profiles 1998-99	Fiske Guide to Colleges 1999	US News and World Report
1. Contact Information				C,S		C,S		C,S	C,I	
2. Map						S,I		C,I		
3. Information on Location								C,I	C,I	
4. Enrollment	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I		C,I		H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	C,I
5. Student Demographics	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I			H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	
6. Admissions Characteristics	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I		C,I			H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	
7. Acceptance Rates								C,I	C,I	C,I
8. Programs and Degrees Offered		H,C,S,I	C,I				H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	
9. Degrees Awarded		H,C,S,I	C,I			H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I			
10. Faculty to Student Ratios			C,I							C,I
11. Retention &/or Persistence Rates			C,I				H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	C,I
12. Graduation Rates	H,C,S,I		C,I	C,I			H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	C,I
13. Tuition and Fees	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I			H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	
14. Financial Aid					H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	H,C,S,I	C,I	C,I	
15. Post Graduate Information			C,I							
16. Finances		H,C,S,I								

H - Historical C - Current S - System-wide I - Institutional

1. Contact Information - *general or admission's address, phone number, website*
2. Map - *showing location of institutions*
3. Information on Location - *size of the town where the institutions is located*
4. Enrollment - *total number of students (headcount), in-state vs. out-of-state, full-time vs. part-time, on vs. off-campus*
5. Student Demographics - *male vs. female, undergraduate vs. graduate, minority/ethnic population*
6. Admissions Characteristics - *for first-time freshmen class: GPA, SAT/ACT scores, AP scores, HS class rank, foreign*
7. Acceptance Rates - *number of students who applied, were accepted, and actually enrolled*
8. Programs and Degrees Offered - *programs offered, level of degrees offered, most popular or unique?*
9. Degrees Awarded - *types and numbers of degrees awarded*
10. Faculty/Student ratios - *average class sizes, number of faculty per student, and rank of professors teaching courses*
11. Retention &/or Persistence Rates - *number of students returning for second year*
12. Graduation Rates - *number of students completing and undergraduate degree within four, five, and six years*
13. Tuition and Fees - *annual costs to attend institution for in-state vs. out-of-state, FT vs PT, including room and board*
14. Financial Aid - *percent of students receiving aid, average size of award*
15. Graduates - *percent of undergraduates who pursue graduate degrees, employment of bachelor's degree recipients*
16. Finances - *appropriations to and/or revenues of the institutions*

II. Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas in Various Documents including:

- Draft Statistical Abstract
- SCHEV'S Statistical Summary
- Five SCHEV Indicators
- Facts and Figures (tri-fold brochure)
- James Madison University's - Financing of Higher
Education in Virginia: Analysis and Issues
- Washington State Higher Education Statistics
- Maryland 1999 Data Book
- UNC System Institutional Profiles 1998-99
- Fiske Guide to Colleges 1999
- US News and World Report

Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas

In Draft Statistical Abstract, 1998-99

System-wide:

Growth in 4-year schools, average (Growth-1)
Growth in 4-year schools, percentage (Growth-2)
Growth in 4-year schools, by year (Growth-2)
Historical Headcount (Growth-3)
Freshman Shares, 1981-82 and 1998-99 (Growth-4)
Percent of FTEs at Each School, 1980 and 1998 (Growth-5)
Historical Acceptance Rates (Growth-6)
Historical Enrollment Rates (Growth-6)
Undergraduate Tuition and Fees, 1988 and 1998 (Growth-7)
4-year Schools SAT 25-75%, 1991-98 (SAT-1)
4-year Schools SAT 25-75%, 1991 (SAT-2)
4-year Schools SAT 25-75%, 1998 (SAT-2)
Virginia SAT History (SAT-3)
Tuition, by Institution, 1988-89 to 1998-99 (Source-1)
Fees, by Institution, 1988-89 to 1998-99 (Source-1)
VA HS Graduates Attending Va Insts, 1980-81 to 1998-99 (Source-2&3)
SAT Scores, by Inst., mean, 1987/1988 and 25-75, 1991-1998 (Source-4)
Unidentified Table (Source-5)
Fall Headcount and FTE, 1980-1998 (Source-6)
In-state vs. Out-of-State, Historical, 1980-1998 (Source-7)
Va. Four-year School Acceptance Rates, 1973-98 (Source-8)

Institution Specific:

Text- Size of Student Body
Percent of Virginians
Change of FTE and headcount
Ratio of headcount to FTE
Change in tuition and fees
Change in costs attributable to fees
SAT acceptance information
Percent of applicants accepted
Enrollment information
Graduation rate (annually as a percent of total student body)
Charts -Percent of Students Receiving Degrees, 1987-1998
SAT 25-75%, 1991-98
Fees and Tuition: In-state, 1988-89 to 1998-99
Fees and Tuition: Out-of-state, 1988-89 to 1998-99
Percent of In-state vs. Out-of-State Students, 1980 - 1998
Headcount of In-state vs. Out-of-State Students, 1980 - 1998
Historical Headcount vs. FTE, 1980 - 1998
First-time Freshmen, total, 1973-1998

Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas

Examples of Current SCHEV Publications

I. Statistical Summaries (SCHEV website)

- Public Institutions (totals)
 - Enrollment
 - Admissions
 - Degrees
 - Course Distribution
 - Financial Aid
 - Faculty
 - Research Activity
 - Financial (tuition and fees, operating budget, etc.)
- Individual Institutions (totals)
 - Enrollment
 - Admissions
 - Degrees
 - Course Distribution
 - Financial Aid
 - Faculty
 - Research Activity
 - Financial (tuition and fees, operating budget, etc.)

II. Indicators of Institutional Mission

Indicators 1 - Who enters?

- 1994 First-Time Freshmen Profile
- 1994 Entering Transfer Students Profile
- 1994 First-Time Graduate Students Profile
- Who progresses?
- Who pays? How much?
- State Council of Higher Education Information

Indicators 2 - What do students learn?

Indicators 3 - What do students experience?

- Who are where are the students?
- What are some aspects of the student academic experience?
 - Most frequently chosen major by program area
 - Instruction of students by faculty type
 - Description of special academic opportunities
 - Percentage of students enrolling a class with less than 25 students
 - Percentage of programs requiring students to integrate and apply their knowledge
- What questions should prospective students ask?
- Contact information for each institution

Indicators 4 - Who are the faculty?

How do faculty members spend their time?

Who are the faculty? (qualifications, gender, race, FT vs PT)

How are faculty evaluated, rewarded, and supported?

Indicators 5 - What happens to graduates?

Graduations rates

Degrees conferred

Employment of graduates

Enrollment in graduate school

How satisfied are the students with their education?

III. Facts and Figures (tri-fold brochure)

Public Four-Year

How Much Does it Cost?

Tuition

Required Annual Fees

Average Room and Board

Total Costs

Student Aid Recipients

Average Award

Who Attends?

Total Enrollment

Freshmen Enrollment

Freshmen Virginia Resident %

Freshman Female %

Freshmen Ethnic Minority %

Median SAT

Median High School GPA

How Many Graduate

Six Year Graduation %

Public Two-Year: Richard Bland College and the Community Colleges

How Much Does it Cost?

Tuition

Required Annual Fees

Average Room and Board

Total Costs

Student Aid Recipients

Average Award

Who Attends?

Total Enrollment

Freshmen Enrollment

Freshman Female %

Freshmen Ethnic Minority %

Median SAT

Median High School GPA

What About Graduates

Employed

Community College

Four-Year Institution

Number of Graduates

Explanation of Terms

Virginia's Institutional Index
Fields/Issue Areas

***James Madison University -
Financing of Higher Education in Virginia: Analysis and Issues***

ISSUES

TUITION AND FEES

National Trends

Regional Trends

State Trends

JMU Tuition and Fee History

STATE APPROPRIATIONS

National Trends

Regional Trends

State Trends

Financial Aid Appropriations

JMU Total Operating Revenues

EXPENDITURES

Total Operating Expenditures

Faculty and Staff Salaries

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

1999 General Assembly Operating Amendments

1999 General Assembly Capital Amendments

Virginia's Institutional Index
Fields/Issue Areas

State of Washington - Higher Education Statistics

List of Institutions

Map of Four-Year Institutions

Map of Two-Year Institutions

List of Institutions Operating in Washington Not Included in Tables

ENROLLMENT

Fall Headcount Enrollment: All Institutions

Enrollment by Gender, Race, and Full-Time/Part-Time

Public Enrollment by Residence

Public High School Graduates Continuing on to Public Higher Education in Wash.

Washington's Higher Education Participation Rate and Ranking

Enrollment by Level, public vs. private

Enrollment by Level: Undergraduate/Graduate, public vs. private

Enrollment by Level, full-time vs. part-time

Enrollment by Level, gender

Enrollment by Level, race/ethnicity

DEGREES GRANTED

Doctoral Degrees Granted, public and private 4yr institutions

Professional Degrees Granted, public and private 4yr institutions

Degrees Granted, by private institution

Associate Degrees and Certificates Granted

Degrees Granted, by gender

Degrees Granted, by race

Degrees by Field, gender

Degrees by Field, race/ethnicity

FINANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

General Fund Expenditures, higher ed vs. other gov. functions

General Fund Expenditures, percentage comparison of gov. functions

State General Fund and Operating Fees, fy84 through fy97

Average Annual FTE

Annual Tuition and Fees, in-state and out-of-state

Need-Based Financial Aid Expenditures, sources of aid

Need-Based Financial Aid Expenditures, types of Aid

Financial Aid Expenditures and Number of Students, state need grant

Financial Aid Expenditures and Number of Students, state work-study

BRANCH CAMPUSES

Branch Campuses in Washington

Branch Campus Enrollments and Locations

Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas

Maryland - 1999 Data Book

Comparative Higher Education Statistics - Maryland and National

STUDENTS

- Core and Non-Core Curriculum Students Needing Remediation in College
- Performance of Core and Non-Core Curriculum Students
- Average SAT Scores of Entering Freshmen / 1997
- Undergraduate Enrollment / Fall 1997
- Graduate and Professional Enrollment / Fall 1997
- Total Enrollment / 1997
- Enrollment at Maryland State-Aided Independent Institutions / Fall 1997
- Enrollment by Race and Gender / Fall 1997

RETENTION AND GRADUATION

- By Race at Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions
- Community College Students Graduating Four Years After Transferring / Class of 1993-1994
- Community College Graduation and Transfer Rates/ Class of 1993
- Number of Community College Students Transferring in 1997

DEGREES

- By Institution / 1996-1997
- By Major Program / 1996 - 1997
- By Race and Gender / 1996 - 1997

FACULTY

- Full and Part-Time / Fall 1997
- Full-Time Faculty by Race and Gender / Fall 1997
- Full-Time, Average Salary / Fall 1997

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES

- Community Colleges, Unrestricted Revenues / FY 1998
- Community Colleges, Unrestricted Expenditures / FY 1998
- Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities, Unrestricted Revenues and Expenditures / FY

1998

- Aid to Independent Institutions / FY 1998
- Total Capital Budget Authorizations by Campus / FY 1994 - 1999

TUITION AND FEES

- Community College Resident Credit Hour Tuition and Fees / 1994-1998
- Public Four-Year Undergraduate Tuition and Fees / 1995-1998
- Public Four-Year Graduate Credit-Hour Tuition / 1994-1998

FINANCIAL AID

- Undergraduate Financial Aid / 1996-1997
- Graduate Financial Aid / 1996-1997
- Maryland Financial Aid Program Expenditures / FY 1998

PRIVATE CAREER SCHOOLS

- Enrollments by School / 1997 Annual Report
- Number, Enrollment and Completion Rate by School Type / 1997 Annual Report

Virginia's Institutional Index

Fields/Issue Areas

North Carolina's On-Line - 1998-99 Institutional Profiles

- Equality of Opportunity
- Letter from the President
- Introduction
- Map of NC
- Notes and Explanations
- Institutional Information
 - Brief Description
 - History
 - Location
 - Academic Calendar
 - Undergraduate Enrollment
 - Student Services
 - Financial Aid
 - Estimated Student Costs
 - Freshmen Class Profile
 - Bachelor's Degree Programs Offered
 - Admissions Information
 - Retention, Graduation, and Persistence Rates
 - Full Time Faculty
- Appendices to Institutional Profiles (System-wide information)
 - Advanced Placement Accepted 1998-99 (all institutions)
 - Minimum Scores on AP Exams Required for Course Credit at University of North Carolina Institutions (1998-99)
 - Fall Semester Enrollment at University of North Carolina Institutions, 1997
 - Estimated Annual Student Costs for Un of North Carolina Institutions, 1997-98
 - Freshman Class Profiles, Fall 1997
 - Requirements for Undergraduate Admission
 - Freshman Application for the Constituent Institutions of Un. of North Carolina
- Directors of Admissions and Directors of Financial Aid

Virginia's Institutional Index
Fields/Issue Areas

1999 Fiske Guide to Colleges

Contact information including, address, phone, website
Location (ie suburban, urban, etc. Text includes more thorough description)
Total Enrollment
Undergraduates
Male/Female
SAT Ranges
ACT Ranges
Percent Receiving Financial Aid
Costs (tuition and fees)
Phi Beta Kappa
Applicants
Enrolled
Graduated in Five Years
Returning Freshmen
Academics (strength of)
Social - rating
Quality of Campus Life - rating
Strongest Programs
Text - More in-depth description of institutional locale
 Unique institutional and academic characteristics
 Demographic information about students
 Geographical make-up of student body
 Housing, on-campus, off-campus, other options
 Campus activities
Admissions deadlines
Percent of financial aid needs met
Other institutions applicants tend to apply to

Virginia's Institutional Index
Fields/Issue Areas

US News and World Report - College Rankings

Academic reputation

Acceptance rate

Alumni giving

Class size

Expenditures per student

Faculty compensation

Faculty with Ph.D.'s

Freshman retention rate

Full-time faculty

Graduation rate

Graduation rate performance -

The difference between the actual six-year graduation rate for students entering in the fall of 1991 and the rate expected from entering test scores and education expenditures. Note: In past years, this indicator was referred to as "value added."

High school class standing

SAT/ACT scores

Student/faculty ratio

Yield - The ratio of students who enroll to those admitted to the fall 1997 freshman class.

IV. Virginia's Institutional Index

Possible Outline for Future Publication

I. Table of Contents

II. Executive Summary/Introduction

III. Maps of Institutions

- 1) Four-year public institutions and Richard Bland College
- 2) Community Colleges
- 3) Private Non-profit (CICV and a few others)

IV. System-Wide Information (covering all "fields/issue areas" identified and agreed upon)

V. Four-year Public Institutions and Richard Bland College

- 1) Two options or a combination
- 2) Present the information by institution or by "issue area"
- 3) Contact information

VI. Community Colleges

Present system-wide information
Contact information

V. Private Non-Profit Institutions

General overview and summary
Contact information

VI. Other Institutions

General overview and summary
Contact information

VII. Definitions/Glossary/Explanation of Terms

V. Virginia's Institutional Index

Proposed Timeline

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
March 25 -	Council Meeting	Update and seek direction
May 18 -	Council Meeting	Update on staff efforts and proposed format based on Council recommendations
June - August	Contact Institutions	Gather any information needed not already regularly submitted to the Council
August - Sept.	Information Submitted	Institutions must submit all data from previous year by this point
Sept. - Oct.	Input Data	Staff will take updated data and format for the proposed document
Oct.	Council Meeting	Draft of the document presented
Nov. 99	Council Meeting	Approval of final document

Outreach Committee Executive Summary

Tab O3 - Board of Visitors Training Session

Subject:

Spring (April 30) 1999 Board of Visitors Training Session

Background:

By statute, the Council is charged with developing and hosting important educational training programs for governing boards of visitors at public institutions of higher education in Virginia. In fall 1998, the Council agreed to host two sessions each fiscal year, with the spring session focusing on general and timely issues of interest to all boards of visitors members. The spring 1999 Session will be held on Friday, April 30 at the Richmond Omni Hotel. A "Save the Date" notice for the event was sent in early February to Council members, all boards of visitors and public college presidents.

Staff continues to work on finalizing the Training Session agenda, identifying, contacting and confirming speakers, and working out logistical arrangements with the hotel.

A *draft* agenda was sent out on March 5 to members of the Outreach Committee and selected others seeking their comments and suggestions. This valuable feedback will be incorporated into the final agenda. Invitations will be sent no later than Friday, March 19, which is six weeks in advance of the event.

A revised timeline of major tasks and activities involved in planning the event is attached.

Action Needed:

None.

Staff Recommendation:

None.

Materials:

Revised timeline for planning of the Council-sponsored Board of Visitors Training Session on April 30, 1999.

Fiscal Notes:

The Council has budgeted \$20,000 for the Spring 1999 BOV Training Session.

BOARD OF VISITORS TIMETABLE (Revised)

Event Date: Friday, April 30, 1999

WHEN	WHO	WHAT/ACTION/DELIVERABLE
January 19	Outreach Committee/ Council	Endorsed proposed agenda focusing primarily on 1) development of the "Virginia Plan," and 2) preparation for funding policy issues related to the 2000-2002 biennial budget.
January 29	Marcus	Select date and location for event
February 5	Stromberg	Secure site for event
February 8	Nardo/Robinson	Post "Save the Date" notice to Council members, 240+ board members & public college presidents
February 8 - 16	Nardo	Work with Director to agree on theme of event, identify prominent speakers to invite, and determine program format.
February 16	Nardo	Deliver update to Outreach Committee, including ideas for possible speakers and draft agenda
February 17	Allen/Nardo	Begin selecting/contacting speakers
February 23	Nardo	Present update to the Executive Committee
March 5	Nardo	Send draft agenda to Council Members and others for comment
March 15	Allen/Nardo	Finalize agenda and have speakers confirmed
March 19	Nardo/Robinson	Mail invitation and agenda to Council members, 240+ board members & public college presidents
March 25	Nardo	Deliver update on planning activities related to the conference at the Council Meeting
March 29	Stromberg	Finalize space requirements and adjust as necessary following Council meeting
April 6	Allen/Nardo	Review program with principals
April 12	Nardo/Robinson	Start to prepare resources materials/notebooks for conference participants
April 16	Stromberg	Confirm equipment needs of speakers and communicate necessary information to location
April 20	Nardo	Deliver update on activities related to the conference at the Council Meeting
April 23	Stromberg	RSVPs due to Council offices
April 23	Nardo/Robinson	Finalize resource materials/notebooks
April 26	Stromberg	Confirm numbers to location
April 30	Council/Staff	EVENT

4th DRAFT **SPRING BOARD OF VISITORS TRAINING SESSION** 4TH DRAFT

**AN EDUCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM SPONSORED BY
THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA**

**THE OMNI HOTEL
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA**

APRIL 30, 1999

9:00 A.M. – 3:45 P.M.

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| 8:00 – 9:00 a.m. | Registration and Continental Breakfast |
| 9:00 – 9:10 a.m. | Welcome; Overview and Objectives of Session
<i>John D. Padgett</i>
<i>Chairman, State Council of Higher Education</i> |
| 9:10 - 9:40 a.m. | Address
<i>Governor James S. Gilmore III or M. Boyd Marcus, Jr.</i>
[speaker not yet confirmed]
<i>TOPIC: Expectations of Boards of Visitors</i> |
| 9:40 – 10:00 a.m. | Remarks
<i>Edward L. Flippen</i> [speaker not yet confirmed]
<i>Chair, Blue Ribbon Commission on Higher Education</i>
<i>TOPIC: Update on BRC's work</i> |
| 10:00 – 12:00 p.m. | Presentations and Participant Discussion on Timely
Issues in Virginia Higher Education (3 Concurrent Sessions)
<small>Each repeated 3 times; in small groups, participants rotate through each breakout session.</small>

The Virginia Plan 2000-2002
<i>Dr. William B. Allen</i> [confirmed]
<i>Director, Council of Higher Education</i>

Title of Talk To Be Determined (TBD)
<i>Scott D. Pattison</i> [speaker not yet confirmed]
<i>Director, Department of Planning and Budget</i>
<i>TOPIC: Budget Issues of Importance to BOV members</i> |
| 10:35 – 10:45 a.m. | Break |

12:00 – 12:20 p.m.	Remarks <i>Senator John H. Chichester [speaker not yet confirmed]</i> <i>Co-Chairman, Senate Finance Committee</i> <i>TOPIC: Update on Higher Education Funding in 99 Session</i>
12:20 – 12:50 p.m.	Lunch and Informal Discussions among Participants
12:50 – 1:30 p.m.	Title of Remarks TBD <i>Dr. Clifford Adelman, Senior Research Analysts [confirmed]</i> <i>U.S. Department of Education</i> <i>TOPIC: Overview of data relating to quality, emphasizing graduation rates which are an important indicator to help boards assess institutional productivity.</i>
1:30 – 1:40 p.m.	Break
1:40 – 3:20 p.m.	Presentations and Participant Discussion on Timely Issues in Virginia Higher Education (3 Concurrent Sessions) <i>Each repeated 3 times; in small groups, participants rotate through each breakout session.</i> Title of Talk <i>Maurice Scherrens [speaker not yet confirmed]</i> <i>Executive Vice-President of Finance</i> <i>George Mason University</i> <i>TOPIC: Administrative Best Practices Report</i> Title of Talk TBD <i>Dr. Clifford Adelman and Dr. William B. Allen [confirmed]</i> <i>TOPIC: Affirmative Action and Higher Education</i> Organizing and Conducting Presidential Searches <i>[Speaker(s) Still Being Identified and not yet confirmed]</i> <i>Speaker(s) TBD</i> <i>Title(s)</i>
3:25 – 3:40 p.m.	Remarks <i>The Honorable Wilbert Bryant [not yet confirmed]</i> <i>Secretary of Education</i> <i>TOPIC: Final thoughts on effective governance</i>
3:40 – 3:45 p.m.	Conclusion <i>John D. Padgett</i> <i>Chairman, State Council of Higher Education</i>

Note: Tentative Plans call for the Council of Visitors to meet immediately after the BOV Training Session from 4:00 to 5:30 p.m. to conduct administrative business and possibly discuss topic(s) of mutual interest.